HARVARD UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Volume VI Number 4 December 1982

Ukrainian Research Institute
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

A generous subsidy toward the publication of this issue
has been provided by the
Jarema S. Kurdydyk Trust of the Ukrainian Studies Fund, Inc.

*The editors assume no responsibility for
statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.*

ISSN 0363-5570
Published by the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Printed by the Harvard University Printing Office

This issue typeset by Imprimerie Orientaliste, Louvain, Belgium;
Brevis Press, Bethany, Conn.; and the Computer Based Laboratory,
Harvard University.

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

Omeljan Pritsak is Mykhailo S. Hrushevs'kyi Professor of Ukrainian History and director of the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University.

Catherine D. Bowers received a Ph.D. in Russian from Bryn Mawr College in 1979 and is now with the Soviet Interview Project at the University of Chicago.

A. B. Pernal is associate professor of history at Brandon University, Brandon, Manitoba.

D. F. Essar is associate professor of French at Brandon University.

Victor Ostapchuk is a Ph.D. candidate in Altaic and Inner Asian Studies at Harvard University.

Harvard Ukrainian Studies

volume VI, number 4

December 1982

The Hunnic Language of the Attila Clan

OMELJAN PRITSAK

CONTENTS

Introduction

In about A.D. 370, a nomadic people called the Huns invaded Eastern Europe. Coming from the East, and having subjugated the Ostrogothic realm of Hermanarich, they established a nomadic empire which soon stretched to the Roman Danubian *limes*. The Hunnic empire reached its apex under the leadership of Attila (444-453). In 451, however, Attila was defeated in the "Catalaunian fields" in Gaul by the united forces of the Romans and the Visigoths. His sudden death two years later was followed by an internal power struggle among his sons during which the empire's subjugated peoples—mainly the Germanic Gepidae,

Ostrogoths, and Heruli — revolted successfully. A great battle fought in 455 on the still unidentified Pannonian river Nadao put an end to the Hunnic empire's unity and greatness.

But some time later, as we learn from Jordanes, groups of Huns returned to their "inner" territory on the river *Vār* (= Dnieper) in the Ukraine. There they reorganized on a smaller scale, and still held control over the Danubian Scythia Minor (modern Dobrudža). Unfortunately, sources for that period are very taciturn about Hunnic developments, but the Huns continue to be mentioned, if sporadically, until at least the middle of the sixth century.

It was one of the originators of French sinology, Joseph Deguignes (1721-1800), who in 1748 first put the question of the ethnic origin of the Huns on a scholarly level.[a] Since that time, historians, philologists, and, later, also archaeologists and ethnographers have continued the discussion. Nonetheless the question remains unresolved. Since the character of the Hunnic language has consistently held a central place in that debate, reexamination of the language is a requisite for any resolution of it.[b]

The Hunnic problem is of importance in Ukrainian scholarship not just as an interesting academic topic. Not only did the Huns rule over the Ukraine for at least two hundred years (ca. 375-560), but also they apparently merged with successive nomadic waves in that area and had a part in Ukrainian ethnogenesis.

In 1829, a Carpatho-Ukrainian scholar working in Moscow, Jurij Huca-Venelin (1802-1839), developed a theory about the Hunnic origin of the Slavs.[c] His theory found many supporters, including such eminent Russian scholars as the historian Dmitrij Ivanovič Ilovajskij (1832-1920)[d] and the ethnographer Ivan Egorevič Zabelin (1820-1908). According to Zabelin, the Huns were the retinue *(družina)* of the northern Slavs who were invited by the southern Slavs to help fight against the Goths.[e] In 1858, A. F. Vel'tman identified the name Huns (via the form *Kwäne*) with the name Kievans and proposed to call Attila "the autocrat of all Rus'."[f]

[a] *Mémoirs sur l'origine des Huns et des Turcs* (Paris, 1748).
[b] A recent bibliography is given in fn. 1, below.
[c] *Drevnie i nynešnie Bolgare*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1829).
[d] Ilovajskij began publishing a series of his studies and polemical articles in 1881: "Vopros o narodnosti Russov, Bolgar i Gunnov," *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveščenija*, May 1881. Concerning the discussion, especially between Ilovajskij and the Byzantinist Vasilij Grigor'evič Vasil'evskij (1838-1899), see Konstantin Inostrancev, *Xunnu i Gunny* (Leningrad, 1926), pp. 105-109.
[e] *Istorija russkoj žizni*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1876), pp. 218-360.
[f] This astounding identification was made in his *Attila i Rus' v IV-V vekax* (Moscow, 1858).

The reader will understand then, why, after having studied the Hunnic problem for over thirty years, I venture to present the results of my investigations in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

* * *

A. *The Sources*

The works of Greek writers (especially Priscus, d. ca. 472) and Latin writers (especially Jordanes, A. D. 551, based on the work of Cassiodorus, *fl.* ca. 530) contain the names of some twenty-five persons among Attila's immediate kin and eight names of their close associates—together thirty-three names over a period of some one hundred and eighty years (ca. 375-555). One can assume that all these persons spoke the same idiom. It is reasonable, then, to use this onomastic material to determine the language of the ruling clan of the so-called European Huns.[1]

Although contemporaneous sources include many more names of "barbarians" than the thirty-three selected here, for the time being one can dismiss these as uncertain, in consideration of the multiethnic character of any steppe empire.[2]

[1] Special literature dealing with the language of the Huns includes: Gerhard Doerfer, "Zur Sprache des Hunnen," *CAJ* (Wiesbaden) 17 (1973): 1-50; Lajos (Louis) Ligeti, "*Dengizikh* és *Bécs* állítólagos kun megfelelői," *Magyar Nyelv* (Budapest), 58 (1962): 142-52 = L. L., *A Magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van*, vol. 2 (Budapest, 1979), pp. 155-61; Otto Maenchen-Helfen, "Zu Moór's Thesen über die Hunnen," *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* (Heidelberg), 14 (1963): 273-78; idem, "Iranian names of the Huns," in *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume* (London, 1970), pp. 272-75; idem, *The World of the Huns* (Berkeley, 1973), especially chap. 9: "Language," pp. 376-443; Elemer Moór, "Zur Herkunft der Hunnen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Namenmaterials," *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 14 (1963): 63-104; idem, "Noch einmal zum Hunnenproblem," *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 16 (1965): 14-22; Gyula (Julius) Németh, "A hunok nyelve," in *Attila és hunjai* (Budapest, 1940), pp. 217-26, 315-16 = [Turkish translation by János Eckmann], "Hunların dili," *Türk Dili Belleten*, ser. 3, nos. 12-13 (Ankara, 1949), pp. 106-114; Pavel Poucha, "Mongolische Miscellen. IV. Zum Hunnenproblem," *CAJ* 1 (1955): 287-71; Omeljan Pritsak, "Kultur und Sprache der Hunnen," in *Festschrift für Dmytro Čyževs'kyj* (Berlin, 1954), pp. 238-49 = O. P., *Studies*, no. VII; idem, "Ein hunnisches Wort," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden), 104 (1954): 124-35 = O. P., *Studies*, no. IX; idem, "Der Titel Attila," *Festschrift für Max Vasmer* (Berlin, 1956), pp. 404-419, = O. P., *Studies*, no. VIII; Gottfried Schramm, "Eine hunnisch-germanische Namensbeziehung?," *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 20 (1960): 129-155. (Note the list of abbreviations, pp. 474-76.)

[2] On the ethnic problems of a steppe empire, see Pritsak, *OR*, 1: 10-20; and idem, "The Slavs and the Avars," in *Gli Slavi occidentali e meridionali nell'alto medioevo. Spoleto, 15-21 aprile 1982*, Trentesima Settimana di studio (Spoleto, in press).

The thirty-three names selected here are divided into two groups:

(1) names of actual members of the dynasty (nos. 1-25), which seem to be either personal names or titles;

(2) names of close associates of the dynasty (nos. 26-33), which frequently represent office titles, appellations, epithets, or even nicknames.

The Hunnic material to be analyzed here belongs to four periods: (1) ca. A.D. 375 — the time of the first name, that of the epic Hunnic ruler who allegedly entered the East European Ostrogothic realm then, as recorded by Jordanes from the Hunnic epic tradition; (2) ca. 390-420 — the time of names 2 to 6, which are historical, although the relationship of their bearers to Attila (and to each other) remains unknown; (3) ca. 420-480 — the names in this subdivision, including 7-21 and 26-33, are taken from the surest historical and genealogical information; (4) ca. 536-555 — the fully historical names, 22-25, are of actors in the Hunnic epilogue.

The Hunnic names that have come down to us are transmitted mostly in the works of fourteen contemporary (5th-6th century) Greek and Latin writers. Six Greek and two Roman writers lived in the fifth century, whereas three Greek and three Roman writers were from the sixth century. Also, four works (two Greek and two Roman) were written between the seventh and ninth century by authors who had at their disposal rich sources since then lost. We have no serious reason to question the accuracy of their data.

The majority of the Hunnic names (20 of the 33) were recorded by the intelligent politician and historian Priscus of Panium in Thrace (d. after 472), who spent some time at Attila's court (448-449) as the Byzantine ambassador to the Hunnic realm. In fact, thirteen, or more than one-third, of the names are known to us only from Priscus's notations: ᾿Αδάμει$^{\text{dat}}$, ᾿Ατακάμ, Βασίχ, Βέριχος, ᾿Εδέκων, ᾿Εσκάμ, Ζέρκων, Ἤσλαν$^{\text{acc}}$, Κουρσίχ, Κρέκαν, Μάμα$^{\text{gen}}$, Σκόττας, ῾ᾩηβάρσιον$^{\text{acc}}$.

An earlier Byzantine ambassador to the Huns, Olympiodorus of Thebae in Egypt, visited the Hunnic rulers in 412. In his historical writings he mentions two names unknown in other sources: Δονάτος and Χαράτων. The history of Justinian I's reign by Agathias (*fl.* 556) mentions two more otherwise unrecorded names: ᾿Ελμίγγειρος and ᾿Ελμινζούρ.

A later but nonetheless reliable chronicler, Theophanes Byzantius (752-818), who incorporated materials from many lost sources in his work, also saved one Hunnic name: Γιέσμου$^{\text{gen}}$.

Three church historians of the first half of the fifth century transmitted several names: Socrates of Constantinople (d. 440), Sozomen of Ghazzah in Palestine (d. ca. 450), and Theodoret of Antioch (d. 451). Of the Greek authors, only Sozomen and the secular historian Zosimus (who wrote after 498) mentioned the name Οὔλδιν ~ Οὔλδης, and Socrates notes the name Οὔπταρος.

The "Chronicon paschale," compiled by an unknown cleric during the reign of Heraclius I (610-641) sometime shortly after 628, contains variants of two names: Βλίδας and Δινζίριχος.[3]

First among the Latin authors is Jordanes, a pro-Roman Ostrogoth who in 551 (probably in Ravenna) wrote his "Getica," or history of the Goths (and Huns). In composing the work he made use of a very important (now lost) Gothic history by the Roman senator Cassiodorus (ca. 490-585), as well as of Gothic and Hunnic popular traditions.

Jordanes includes thirteen Hunnic names in his work. Six of them also appear in the work of Priscus (*Attila* = Ἀττίλας, *Bleda* = Βλήδας, *Dintzic* = Δεγγιζίχ, *Hernac* = Ἠρνάχ, *Mundzuco*^{abl} = Μουνδίουχον^{acc}, *Roas* = Ῥοῦα^{gen}), one in the work of Sozomen and Zosimus (*Huldin* = Οὔλδιν ~ Οὔλδης) and two in the work of Socrates (*Octar* = Οὔπταρος, *Roas* = Ῥούγας). Jordanes himself preserved four Hunnic names for posterity: *Balamur*, *Ellac*, *Emnetzur*, and *Vltzindur*.

Several names already known from the Greek and other Latin sources occur in the historical apology for Christianity by the Spaniard Paulus Orosius (*fl.* 414-417), as well as in the "Gallic Chronicle of 452," the "Gallic Chronicle of 511," and, especially, in the Chronicle by Marcellinus Comes (534). The last work gives five Hunnic names: *Attila*, *Bleda*, *Denzic-* = Δινζίχιρ-, *Huldin*, and *Mundo*.

Two Hunnic names survived in Latin works: *Laudaricus* in the "Gallic Chronicle of 511" (mentioned above), and *Hunigasio*^{abl} in the (older) "Vita Sancti Lupi" (probably compiled in the 5th c.; the saint [ca. 383-479] was bishop of Troyes in France).[4]

[3] Editions of the Byzantine Greek sources are the following: Agathias, *Historiarum libri quinque*, ed. Ludwig Dindorf, *HGM* 2 (Leipzig, 1871), pp. 132-432; *Chronicon paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1832); Joannes Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn, 1831); Olympiodorus, ed. René Henry, "Codices" 1-84, in *Photius, Bibliothèque* (Paris, 1959); Priscus, in *EL*, ed. Carolus de Boor, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1903); Procopius, *History of the Wars*, ed. H. B. Dewing, 6 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1914-35); Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. P. Migne, *PG*, vol. 67 (Paris, 1864), cols. 28-842; Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. P. Migne, *PG*, vol. 67 (1864), cols. 843-1630; Theodoret, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. Felix Scheidweiler (Berlin, 1954); Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883); Zosimus, *Historia nova*, ed. Ludwig Mendelssohn (Leipzig, 1887).

[4] Editions of the Latin sources are the following: "Anonymus Ravennas," ed. O. Cuntz,

In order to facilitate use and comparison, the source data is presented on p. 434 in parallel Greek and Latin columns, arranged in two parts: (1) names of members of the dynasty, given chronologically (nos. 1-25); and (2) names of the leading Hunnic statesmen and officers from ca. 448-449, arranged alphabetically (nos. 26-33).

B. *Analysis of the Onomastic Material* (nos. 1-33)

I. Names of Members of the Dynasty

1. *Balamur*, *Balamber*. This name occurs three times in the work of Jordanes (551); it has come down to us in five variants, which can be systematized into three categories:[5]

Balaber	*Balamber*	*Balamur*
	Balambyr	*Balamir*.

The form *Balaber* is undoubtedly a corruption of *Balamber*, resulting from the omission of *-m-*. The forms with the second *-b-* (*Balamber*, *Balambyr*) seem to evolve from a dittography (*b-b*); *-mir*, in the variant *Balamir*, is certainly secondary and owes its existence to the Gothic onomastic "suffix"*-mir*/*-mer*.[6] Therefore I regard *Balamur* as the only original Hunnic form of the name. The word recalls the appellative attested in Mongolian (*SH balamut*[7] ~ WMo *balamud* ~ *balamad*),[8] meaning "savage, wild, reckless, venturous, dashing, crazy."

Danube-Bulgarian had the suffix /mA/, with the same meaning as the Middle Turkic suffix /mAt/ 'the greatest among': DBulg *dval+ma* 'horse herdsman' (originally, 'the greatest among the horseherd') = MTü *qoy+mat* 'shepherd' (originally, 'the greatest among the sheepherd'). This Turkic suffix consists of two elements: /mA/ and the plurative suffix

---

Itineraria Romana (Leipzig, 1929), see also the edition of Schnetz (listed on p. 475); "Gallic Chronicle of 452," ed. Theodor Mommsen, "Chronica Gallica a. *CCCCLII*," *Chronica Minora* 1 (= *MGH AA*, 9) (Berlin, 1892); "Gallic Chronicle of 511," ed. T. Mommsen, "Chronica Gallica a. *DXI*," *Chronica Minora* 1 (= *MGH AA*, 9) (Berlin, 1892); Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Elena C. Skržinskaja, *Jordan o proisxoždenii i dejanijax getov, Getica* (Moscow, 1960); Jordanes, *Romana*, ed. Th. Mommsen (= *MGH AA*, *5*, *I*) (Berlin, 1882); Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, ed. Th. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* 2 (= *MGH AA*, 11) (Berlin, 1894); Orosius, *Historiorum adversum paganos libri VII*, ed. Karl Zangemeister (Vienna, 1882); "Vita Sancti Lupi," *Bollandi*, *Acta Sanctorum*, *Julii*, Tomus VII, ed. Joannes Baptista Sullerius et al. (Venice, 1769); *Surius*, *Historiae seu vitae sanctorum*, ed. Laurentius Gastaldi (Turin, 1877), vol. VII: *Julius*.

[5] *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, *Jordan*, p. 152, l. 3 (§130); p. 170, l. 40 (§248); p. 171, l. 2 (§249); and fn. 390 on p. 280.

[6] See Schönfeld, *Wörterbuch*, 43 (s.v. *Ballomarius*) and "Etymologischer Index," p. 304.

[7] *SH*, ed. Haenisch, §§129, 248, 249. See also Haenisch, *Wörterbuch*, p. 12.

[8] Lessing, *Dictionary*, pp. 78-79.

Number	Date in Hunnic History	Greek Source: Author/Title of Work	Greek Source: Provenence	Greek Source: Forms of the Hunnic Name	Latin Source: Author/Title of Work	Latin Source: Provenence	Latin Source: Forms of the Hunnic Name
			a) Names of Members of the Dynasty				
1	375				Jordanes	551	*Balamur*
2	395	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Βασίχ			
3	395	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Κουρσίχ			
4	ca. 395-410	Sozomen	ca. 450	Οὔλδις, Οὔλδιν	Orosius	*fl.* 414-417	*Uldin*
		Zosimus	after 498	Οὔλδης	Marcellinus Comes	534	*Huldin*
					Jordanes, "Romana"	551	*Huldin*
5	ca. 410-412	Olympiodorus	425	Δονάτος			
6	ca. 412-420	Olympiodorus	425	Χαράτων			
7	ca. 420-430	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Μουνδίουχον[acc]	Jordanes	551	*Mundzuco*[abl]
		Theophanes	810-814	Μουνδίου[gen]			
8	d. 430	Socrates	d. 440	Οὔπταρος	Jordanes	551	*Octar*
9	ca. 430-433	Socrates	d. 440	Ῥούγας	"Gallic Chron. 452"	ca. 452	*Rugila*
		Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ῥοῦα[gen], Ῥοῦαν[acc]	"Gallic Chron. 511"	6th century	*Ruga*
		Theodoret	d. ca. 451	Ῥωίλας	Jordanes	551	*Roas*
10	d. 449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ὠηβάρσιον[acc]			
11	448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ἐσκάμ			
12	433-444	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Βλήδας	"Gallic Chron. 452"	452	*Bleda*
		Marcellinus Comes	534	Βλίδας	Marcellinus Comes	534	*Bleda*
		"Chronicon paschale"	shortly after 628	Βλίδας	Jordanes	551	*Bleda*
13	433-453	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ἀττίλας	"Gallic Chron. 452"	452	*Attila*
		Procopius	545-551	Ἀττίλας	"Gallic Chron. 511"	6th century	*Attila*
		Malalas	d. 578	Ἀττιλᾶς	Marcellinus Comes	534	*Attila*
					Jordanes	551	*Attila*
					"Anon. Ravennas"	ca. 700	*Attyla*
14	d. 433	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ἀτακάμ			
15	d. 433	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Μάμα[gen]			
16	d. 451				"Gallic Chron. 511"	6th century	*Laudaricus*
17	d. 455				Jordanes	551	*Ellac*
18	d. 469	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Δεγγιζίχ	Marcellinus Comes	534	*Denzicis*[gen]
		Marcellinus Comes	534	Δινζιχίρος			
		"Chronicon paschale"	shortly after 628	Δινζίριχος, Δινζίχ	Jordanes	551	*Dintzic*
19	*fl.* after 469	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ἠρνάχ	Jordanes	551	*Hernac*
		[cf. "The List of the Bulgar Kings"	ca. 8th century	Ирникъ]			
20	*fl.* after 469				Jordanes	551	*Emnetzur*
21	*fl.* after 469				Jordanes	551	*Vltzindur*
22	5th-6th century	Theophanes	810-814	Γιέσμου[gen]			
23	d. 536	Procopius	545-551	Μοῦνδος	Marcellinus Comes	534	*Mundo*
		Malalas	d. 578	Μοῦνδος	Jordanes	551	*Mundo*
		Theophanes	810-814	Μοῦνδος			
24	*fl.* 556	Agathias	ca. 536-582	Ἐλμίγγειρος			
25	*fl.* 556	Agathias	ca. 536-582	Ἐλμινζούρ			
			b) Names of Leading Hunnic Statesmen and Officers ca. 448-449				
26	ca. 448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ἀδάμει[dat]			
27	ca. 448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Βέριχος			
28	ca. 448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ἐδέκων			
29	ca. 448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ζέρκων			
30	ca. 434-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ἤσλαν[acc]			
31	ca. 448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Κρέκαν			
32	ca. 448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Ὀνηγήσιος	"Vita sancti Lupi" (d. 479)		*Hunigasio*[abl.]
33	ca. 448-449	Priscus	d. ca. 472	Σκόττας			

/t/.[9] In Mongolian the suffix has two variants /mAd/ and /mUd/; cf. WMo *bala+mad* ~ *bala+mud.* As to usage, see WMo *aqa+mad* 'senior, elder' (originally, 'the oldest among the brothers'), from *aqa* 'older brother, senior, older'; *yeke+med* 'the highest (official); the elder men, elders or seniors, important people', from *yeke* 'great, big, large'.[10]

Since in Hunnic the suffix /r/ appears in place of the Mongolian /d/ ~ /t/ (see *Emnetzur*, no. 20), one may assume that Hunnic /mUr/ = /mU/+/r/ corresponds to the Turkic /mA/+/t/ (~/mA/+/č/) and Mongolian /mA/+/d/ ~ /mU/+/d/.

The now obsolete noun *bala* had been preserved in WMo in a perephrastic rendition: *bala bol-* 'to lose one's memory from intoxication, senility, or illness; to become stupid'.[11]

Hence the Hunnic *bala+mur* must have had the meaning "the greatest among the venturous, daring"—surely a reasonable designation for a conqueror and empire builder.

2-3. Βασίχ[12] and Κουρσίχ.[13] Both names have the denominal nominal suffix /siG/ which in Turkic (e.g., OT) has the adjectival meaning "like something."[14]

2. In the Hunno-Bulgarian languages /r/ within a consonantic cluster tends to disappear, e.g.: DBulg σεκτεμ ~ шехтемь 'the eighth' < **sikərtəm*; VBulg اتِ *äti* ~ اَج *ači* 'he was' < * *är-di* > **ärti*;[15] Čuv *ïdă* 'added number' < **artuq*.[16] On the other hand, there is a tendency in Turkic[17] (and also partly in Hunnic; see no. 26) to avoid geminatae. Therefore, I propose the following etymology: βασιχ = **basiġ* < **bars+siġ*[18] 'feline-like.' The word *bars* 'feline' also occurs in another Hunnic name discussed here: Ὠηβαρς *Ōy bárs* (see no. 10).

3. The root of κουρσιχ is attested in both Hunnic and Turkic: Bulg Hun **kürä* (i.e., *kür+ä*) = Tü *kür*. In Hunnic the word occurs in the Danube-Bulgarian tribe name κυριγηρ *kürə+gir* (<**kürä+gir*). Karl

[9] Pritsak, "Proto-Bulgarian Etymologies IV-V," in *Studies in honor of Horace G. Lunt* (= *Folia Slavica* 3, pt. 2) (Columbus, Ohio, 1979), pp. 203-205.
[10] Ramstedt, *Einführung*, 1: 79. Cf. Lessing, *Dictionary*, pp. 60, 431.
[11] Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 78.
[12] ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 141, l. 13.
[13] ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 141, l. 13 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 169.
[14] See von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 66, §80; Brockelmann, *OTG*, pp. 136-137, §89.
[15] Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, pp. 58, 74; Farid S. Xakimzjanov, *Jazyk èpitafij volžskix Bulgar* (Moscow, 1978), p. 125, pl. 12, l. 8 (اَتِ), p. 105, pl. 2, l. 7 (اَج).
[16] Egorov, *ÈSČJ*, p. 344.
[17] Pritsak, "Das Alttürkische," *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1. Abt. Bd. 5, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1982), p. 33.
[18] Cf. the change in New Uighur *rs* > *s*: *bars* > *bās* 'feline,' Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 2: 68.

Menges established for the "Altaic" *kür* ~ *kür+ä* the meaning "brave, noble, powerful; universal"; cf. the Pečeneg ruler *s.a.* 972: Куря *Kürä* (*Kür+ä*).[19]

Because of Bang's law ("Mittelsilbenschwund")[20] the form **kür+ä+sig* (> **kurəsig*) became *kürsig*. The name meant: "brave-like, noble-like, universal-like"; cf. Attila, no. 13. Incidentally, a dangerous expedition (to Iran) was headed by two Dioscuri-like members of the dynasty, Basiġ and *Kürsig*.[21]

4. Οὔλδης,[22] *Uldin*[23] ~ *Huldin*.[24] As the Latin forms (already in Orosius, *fl.* 414-417) show, the name had /n/ and not /s/ in its Auslaut. Also see *Vltzin+dur*, no. 21.

The root of the etymons is the verb *öl-*, which survives in Mo (*SH*) *olje* ~ *ol-jei*[25] ~ WMo *öl-jei̯*[26] 'auspice, favourable omen, happiness, good luck'.

The suffix /je/ ~ /jei/ < * /jē/ goes back to */di/+/ge/, since every Mongolian *j* is originally **di*.[27]

This concept is supported by the Mongolian (*SH*) form *oljige* = **öl-jige* (< **öl-dige*; > **öljē* > *ölje*) with the meaning "front part."[28] This word also appears in Mongolian (*SH*) as *oljigetai* (= *öl-jige+tei*) in the phrase *oljigetai tergen* 'wagon with a front part, i.e., protected wagon'); the Chinese equivalent is 衛 *wei* 'ce qui sert a protéger.'[29]

In Hunno-Bulgarian there was also a tendency toward the development of *di* > *ti* > *či*, as the tribal name Οὐλτινζούρ (*öl-tin+čür*) and the personal name *Vltzindur* (*öl-čin+dür*; see no. 21) indicate.

[19] Menges, "Altaic Elements in the Proto-Bulgarian Inscriptions," *Byzantion* (Bruxelles), 21 (1951): 105-106. Cf. Doerfer, *TMEN*, 4: 633-37; Pritsak, *Studies*, no. X, p. 26.

[20] See Räsänen, *Lautgeschichte*, p. 45.

[21] On this myth, see Pritsak, *OR*, 1: 141, 154, 163, 165, 169-70.

[22] Sozomen, ed. Migne, *PG*, pp. 1605 (Οὔλδις), 1608 (Οὔλδιν); Zosimus, ed. Mendelssohn, p. 242, l. 27; p. 243, l. 5 (Οὔλδης) = *Byz Tur*, 2: 230. On the priority of the form in *-n*, see Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, p. 380.

[23] Orosius, ed. Zangemeister, book V, 37-2.

[24] Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, ed. Mommsen, p. 69 > Jordanes, *Romana*, ed. Mommsen, p. 321. The initial *h-*, which was not present in Orosius's notation (see fn. 23), should be regarded as a sixth-century fashion; see, e.g., Jordanes, *Getica* (ed. Skržinskaja): *Alani* (pp. 156, 162-164, 173, etc.) ~ *Halani* (pp. 144, 151), *Alaricus* (pp. 156, 157) ~ *Halaricus* (pp. 155, 158), etc.

[25] Haenisch, *Wörterbuch*, p. 123. Cf. Marian Lewicki, *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIVe siècle: Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389*, vol. 2 (Wrocław, 1959), p. 69, s.v. *ölǯäi̯*.

[26] Lessing, *Dictionary*, 635. Cf. Doerfer, *TMEN*, 1: 173-74.

[27] See Poppe, *MCS*, pp. 265-66.

[28] *SH*, ed. Haenisch, §55.

[29] *SH*, ed. Haenisch, §64. See the comments by Father Antoine Mostaert in his *Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire secrète des Mongols* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), p. 11.

In place of the Mongolian suffix /ge/ ~ /ge+i/ the Hunnic has the suffix /n/. Hence *οὔλδην is **ŏl-di+n*. In Mongolian the word *öljē+i* > *ölje+i* with the adjectival suffix /tu/ appears as the name of one Ilkhan, i.e., the Mongolian ruler in Iran (1304-1316): *Öljeitü* (= *öl-je+i+tü*), literally, "auspicious, happy, lucky, fortunate."

The Hunnic **ŏl-din* (= *öl-di+n*) apparently had a similar meaning.

5. Δονάτ-.[30] The word **donát* corresponds to the Turkic generic word for horse, *yonat* ~ *yont*, *yund*, etc.; see OT Inscr. *yoṇt*, OT Brahmi *yunt* ~ *yund*, MTü Kāšġ. *yond*,[31] Qipčaq/Golden Horde (ca. 1342-1357) *yont* (ёнтя лѣта 'in the horse year').[32] Some Middle Turkic (Abū Ḥaiyān, 1312)[33] and older Ottoman texts spelled the word dissyllabically, the latter with the vowels written plene: يونات *yonat*.[34] The initial consonant, in Greek spelled with δ, was probably *d*. The initial *d-* is attested in Danube-Bulgarian, e.g., δυγε- (*dügä-*) 'to finish.'[35]

Horses played (and still play) a central role in the life and cult of nomads. Horse sacrifice and eating of horsemeat were common expressions of that special role. Each Hunno-Turkic language had at least two terms for "horse," one of which was used as a designation for the "horse year" in the twelve-cycle calendar.[36] Concerning other Hunnic designations for "horse," see Χαράτων (no. 6) and 'Ελμίγγειρ-, etc. (nos. 24-25).

6. Χαράτων.[37] The first component of this name is surely the "Altaic" word *xará* (= *qara*; phonetically with initial spirantization: *q* > [x-]), which had two meanings: (1) 'black' and (2) 'great; northern'.[38] Spirantization in the initial position (*q-* > *x-*)—as well as in the final position (see no. 7)—seems to be a typical Hunnic phonemic feature.

The second element, *tōn* (cf. Turkmen *dōn*), is apparently the Śaka loanword in both Hunnic and Turkic: *thauna* > **taun* > *tōn* 'garment, clothing'.[39] The compound name, *qarátōn*, therefore, had the meaning

[30] Olympiodorus, ed. Dindorf, *HGM*, 1: 457, lines 9, 11, 14 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 119.

[31] See the data in Clauson, *EDT*, p. 846; Räsänen, *EWT*, 211; Doerfer, *TMEN*, 4: 199-200. It was Willy Bang-Kaup who had first established the etymological relation between Δοvατ- and Turkic *yont* (~ **yonat*), "Studien zur vergleichenden Grammatik der Türksprachen," *Sitzungsberichte der...Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin), 37 (1916): 924-25.

[32] Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, p. 67.

[33] Abu Ḥaiyān, ed. Ahmet Caferoğlu (Istanbul, 1931), p. 97a, l. 10: يُونْد

[34] Radloff, *Wb*, vol. 3, col. 545.

[35] Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, p. 88.

[36] Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, pp. 65-68.

[37] Olympiodorus, ed. Dindorf, *HGM*, 1: 457, line 15 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 341.

[38] Pritsak, "Orientierung und Farbsymbolik," *Saeculum* (Munich), 5 (1954): 376-83 = Pritsak, *Studies*, no. I.

[39] Clauson, *EDT*, pp. 512-13. Cf. Doerfer, *TMEN*, 2: 645-47.

"black-clad; with black coat." It must have had some significance and currency among the Huns, since the name was popular among their progeny, the Old Chuvashians. Chuvash villages are usually named after their owner, and several villages still bear the name *Xaratum* (< *xaratōn*). Also, the Chuvash cult seems to include ancestral beings (*kiremet*) called *Xoratom kiremet*.[40]

The word *qara-tōn* seems to have been an elliptical designation for "horse."

In Anatolian dialects and in the Ottoman literary language the word *don* (< *tōn*) has still another meaning: "the coat of a horse" ("die Pferdefarbe").[41]

Evliyā Çelebī, the great Ottoman traveler (*fl.* 1640-1684), describes the funeral ceremony of Mürād IV (d. 9 February 1640) in the following way: *Cemīʿ-i ümmet-i Muḥammad mātene düşüb. At-Meydāninda siyāh dōnli atlarda mātem etdiler*,[42] "All Muslims (lit. 'the community of Muḥammad'), falling into the funeral procession, went into mourning at the At Meydān (Hippodrome) on horses having black coats." The concept of a "horse with a black coat" is expressed here by *siyāh dōnli at*, where *siyāh* 'black' is an Arabic loanword used for "black par excellence" in opposition to *qara* which can mean "dark in general." Like *siyāh dōn*, the compound *qara-tōn* (lit. 'black coat') may be used elliptically for **siyāh dōnli at* = **qara tōnli at* 'black-coated horse'.

In this connection I note that the Hunnic *Xara-Tōn* was the successor of *Donat*[43] ("Horse"). Apparently the elliptical use of the word for "horse" in the title of the successor of a ruler called "Horse" was intentional, especially if we take into account Hunnic totemism.

7. Μουνδιουχ-[44]/ *Mundzuc-*[45] ~ Μουνδιο-[46]. The name of Attila's father has come down to us in two variants, one ending with *-x* and the

[40] Ašmarin, *Thesaurus*, 16:207. On the *kiremet*, see N. V. Nikol'skij, *Xristianstvo sredi čuvaš srednjago Povolžja v XVI-XVIII vekax* (Kazan', 1912), pp. 19-22.

[41] See Radloff, *Wb*, vol. 3, col. 1710 (*don* Osm. Krm. 2. "die Pferdefarbe"); Hamit Zübeyr [Koşay] and İshak Refet, *Anadilden derlemeler* ([Ankara], 1932), p. 107: *don* (G. Antep, Maraş) ... 2. *renk, atının donu kırdır* ("coat; the coat of a horse is gray"). My friend Dr. Şinasi Tekin assured me that the word *don* has that particular meaning in different parts of Anatolia, especially the Bursa region. Under the item *don* in his etymological dictionary, È. V. Sevortjan only quotes Radloff, without any further discussion of the meaning "coat of the horse" (*ÈSTJ*, vol. 3 [1980], p. 263).

[42] *Siyāḥet-nāme*, vol. 1 (Istanbul, 1314/1896), p. 266. Cf. *Tarama sözlüğü*, 2nd ed. (Ankara, 1965), p. 1213.

[43] E. A. Thompson, *A History of Attila and the Huns* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 34, 58.

[44] Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 581, l. 84 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 194.

[45] Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 159, l. 41; p. 172, l. 26.

[46] Theophanes, ed. de Boor, p. 102, l. 15 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 194.

other lacking it. The majority of scholars connected this word with the Turkic *bunčuq*, *munčuq*, *munǯuq*, *minǯaq*, *bonǯuq*, *mončuq*, etc.,[47] and with either of its two meanings, "jewel, pearl, bead" or "flag."[48]

The Turkic etymon has two variants of the initial affricate of the second syllable: voiced *ǯ* and unvoiced *č*.

But careful study of Greek and Latin usages makes it clear that these two languages distinguished between the two affricates. The voiceless *č* was rendered in Greek by ζ and in Latin by *tz*, e.g., δεγγιζιχ : *dintzic*. On the other hand, precisely in our name Greek had *di* and Latin had *dz*: μουνδίου, μουνδίουχ; *mundzuc*; see also μουνδο = *mundo*, when the letter ι was omitted (probably erroneously) in the source in question; significantly enough, the voiced δ: *d* remained.

Based upon these considerations, I propose to read μουνδίουχ/*mundzuc* and μουνδίου ~ μοῦνδο/*mundo* as *munǯúq* and *munǯú* ~ *múnǯu*.[49]

Aulis J. Joki suggested that the Turkic word was a borrowing from a Chinese synonym-compositum: *men* (Arch Chin **mwən*, *GSR* 183f) 'red gem' and *chu* (Arch Chin **ti̯u*, *GSR* 128e) 'pearl'. According to him, the second component was later falsely identified with the Turkic diminutive suffix /ČA/, and was then replaced by its Turkic synonym with the final -*K* (=*q*, *k*): /ČUK/ ~ /ČAK/.[50] The existence of two variants of the Hunnic ruler's name, with and without -*K*, corroborates both Joki's etymology and the connection of Hunnic Μουνδιουχ ~ Μουνδιο with *munǯuq* ~ *munǯu*.

The word belongs to the sphere of "Altaic" religious and royal symbolism. The two meanings given above are interconnected. As in China, so also in the Altaic steppe (as confirmed by Kushan, Old Turkic,

[47] See Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, pp. 409-411, and G. Schramm in *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 20 (1960): 129-55.

[48] On *munǯuq*, etc., see Clauson, *EDT*, p. 349; Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 340; Doerfer, *TMEN*, 4: 24-27.

[49] L. Ligetis's observation (*apud* Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, p. 410) that there is a clearcut distribution in the Turkic languages: Oghuz *b-ǯ* (*bonǯuq*) versus other Turkic languages: *m-č* (e.g., Özb. *munčoq*, Kirg. *mončoq*) has no validity, since Azeri (an Oghuz language) has *munǯuq* and Turkman (also an Oghuz language) has *monǯuq*; in both cases there is an initial *m*-.

In any case, the Turkic situation has no validity for Hunnic, which belonged to a separate Altaic group.

[50] *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen* (Helsinki, 1952), pp. 242-43 (s.v. *nunzo'*). That word, with the meaning "flag," penetrated into Ukrainian and from there to Polish and Russian (*bunčuk*); see Max Vasmer, *REW*, 1: 145.

and Old Uighur art forms) a pearl called *munčuq* represented the sun and the moon. In artistic representations it was put in the mouth of a dragon. The *munčuq* gem was usually surrounded by an aureole of flame, and one of its special uses was as a finial on the imperial flagpole.[51] This term, having so much symbolic value, is also often attested as a personal name, e.g.: *Qizil Munčuq*, a Mongolian commander in Afghanistan (ca. 1223);[52] *Munčuk Ilčikeev*, a Bashkir leader (ca. 1761);[53] *Mončak* ~ *Bunčak* ~ *Puncuk*, a Kalmuk (Torgaut) leader (first half of the seventeenth century).[54]

I conclude that the Hunnic name should be reconstructed as *múnǯu* ~ *munǯúq* 'jewel, flagpole' (phonetically having a spirantization of the final stop: *-q* = [x]). Note also the name Μοῦνδο- (no. 23).

8. *Octar*. This name of an uncle (d. ca. 430) of Attila has been transmitted in two forms: by Socrates (ca. 380-440) as Οὔπταρος,[55] and by Jordanes (A.D. 551), in the "Getica," as *Octar*.[56] The second form is undoubtedly the correct one. The form with *-pt-* has been rightly recognized by M. Schönfeld as Gothic,[57] and the change from *-ct-* to *-pt-* is one of the characteristic features of Balkan-Latin.[58]

There occurs in Turkic (e.g., *QB*, A.D. 1069)[59] and Mongolian (e.g., Kalmuk)[60] the word *öktem* with two sets of meanings: (1) "strong, brave, imperious, impetuous," and (2) "proud, boastful; pride." The etymon is the verb *ökte-* (*oktä-*), in Turkic known until now only from Chagatai (*Wb*): "to encourage, put heart into (someone)," as was rightly stressed by Sir Gerard Clauson.[61] In Mongolian, *ökte-* occurs in *MA* (fifteenth century): *hanisqayin üsüni ökte-be* = Čag *qašiŋ tüketi boldi*

[51] Details in Emel Esin, "*Tös* and *moncuk*: Notes on Turkish flagpole finials," *CAJ* 16 (1972): 14-36, 9 pl.; and M. Fuad Köprülü, "Bayrak," *Islâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (Istanbul, 1949), pp. 401-420. Kāšġarī did not know (or ignored) the religious and symbolic meaning of the word, defining it simply as "bead, trinket.... Anything that is hung to a horse's neck, such as gems, lion's paws, or amulets" (Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 354).

[52] See John Andrew Boyle, *Islamic Studies*, 2:2 (Karachi, 1963), p. 241.

[53] *Materialy po istorii Baškirskoj ASSR*, vol. 4, pt. 1, ed. A. N. Usmanov (Moscow, 1956), p. 221.

[54] Gerhard Friedrich Müller (Miller), *Istorija Sibiri*, vol. 2 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1941), pp. 104, 584; *Materialy po istorii Baškirskoj ASSR*, vol. 1 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1936), p. 173; *Kabardino-russkie otnošenija v XVI-XVIII vv.*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1957), pp. 338, 340.

[55] Socrates, ed. Migne, *PG*, p. 805 (VII, 30) = *Byz Tur*, 2: 237.

[56] Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 159, l. 42.

[57] Schönfeld, *Wörterbuch*, p. 173. See also Schramm (fn. 1), p. 148.

[58] Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, p. 381.

[59] e.g., *QB F*, p. 59, l. 3; *QB H*, p. 157, l. 8.

[60] Ramstedt, *KWb*, p. 294.

[61] Radloff, *Wb*, vol. 1, col. 1181.

'your eyelashes became compact (solid)'.[62] The deverbal nominal suffix /m/ is known both in Turkic and Mongolian.[63] In the latter language, it alternates with the suffix /ri/,[64] e.g., Kalmuk *bō-* (< *boġu-*) 'zuschnüren' which has two synonyms (deverbal nouns), one with the suffix /m/ and the other with the suffix /ri/: *bō-m* and *bō-ri* 'Engpass.' The Turkic correspondence of Mongolian /ri/ is /z/, e.g., *boġ-əz* 'throat', from *boġ-* (Mongolian *boġu-*) 'to strangle, choke'.[65]

Here we have the following correspondences:

Tü /m/ = Mo /m/;

Tü /z/ = Mo /ri/.

Typical of all Hunnic languages is their rhotacism. Therefore the corresponding Hunnic suffix must have been /r/.[66]

Octar/οὔπταρ- simply transmits the Hunnic appellative *Öktär* (**öktä-r*),[67] most probably with the meaning "strong, brave, imperious" Of special importance to our investigation of the language of Attila's Huns is the very clearly documented rhotacism in this name.

9. Ῥούγα-/*Roa-*. The name of Attila's second paternal uncle and predecessor (d. A. D. 433) is attested in three variants: Socrates (A.D. 439) Ῥούγας[68] ("Gallic Chronicle 511," *Ruga*[69]) = Priscus (A.D. 472) Ῥοῦα-[70] (= Jordanes *Roas*)[71] = Theodoret (ca. 393-451) Ῥώϊλας[72] (Lat. variant in "Gallic Chronicle 452," *Rugila*).[73] The Ῥουα- variant is secondary, reflecting the sound change ουγα- > ουα. The final -ς is a Byzantine masculine suffix; the forms in /ila/ are Gothic—or, better, Gothicized—variants.

I consider this name to be a composite form.

The second element, ούγα(∼οῦα), renders the Altaic title *ȫgä*,[74] well known from Old Turkic. If it is a genuinely "Altaic" word, rather than a

[62] *MA*, ed. Poppe, p. 181.

[63] For Turkic, see Räsänen, *Morphologie*, p. 133; for Mongolian, Szabó, *Szóképzés*, p. 45 (§109).

[64] On /ri/ see Szabó, *Szóképzés*, p. 46 (§113).

[65] See Ramstedt, *Einführung*, 2: 143.

[66] On Hunnic rhotacism, see Pritsak, "Ein hunnisches Wort" (fn. 1), pp. 124-35.

[67] On Hunnic *ä* in the non-first syllable, see below, fn. 198.

[68] Socrates, ed. Migne, *PG*, col. 833 (VII 43) = *Byz Tur*, 2: 260.

[69] "Gallic Chronicle 511," ed. Mommsen, p. 659, l. 587; p. 661, l. 589.

[70] Priscus, ed. Dindorf, *HGM*, 1: 276, ll. 6, 20, 23, 24 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 260.

[71] *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 159, l. 42 (§180).

[72] ed. Scheidweiler, p. 340, l. 7.

[73] "Gallic Chronicle 452," ed. Mommsen, p. 658, l. 112; p. 660, l. 116.

[74] The circumflex in Priscus's rendering may reflect Hunnic vocalic length. See also p. 469.

borrowing, it probably derived from *ō̆-* (see OT *ō̆-* 'to think');[75] as to the suffix /GA/, see, e.g., OT *bil-gä* 'wise' (from OT *bil-* 'to know').[76]

The Greek ῥ[*rh*] at the beginning of the name was used to render the Hunnic **hr-*. The latter goes back to **her*, which in an unstressed position lost its vowel. The process can be reconstructed as follows: **hēr ō̆gä* > ** hər ō̆gä* > *hrō̆gä*; note the Greek accents: ῥούγα-, ῥοῦα-.

The word *hēr* corresponds to the Old Turkic Brahmi *hǟr* ~ Runic *är(er)*, etc., meaning "man,"[77] which often occurs as the first component of names or titles, e.g., *Er Böri*, *Er Buġa*, *Er Toŋa*, *Er Toġmiš*.[78]

In Danube Proto-Bulgarian, the second component, *ō̆gä*, occurs as a tribal name with the collective suffix /in/: оугаинъ (*ō̆gä-in*).[79]

10. Ὠηβάρσ-.[80] This personal name of Attila's paternal uncle (d. 449) also has two components, distinguished in the manuscript of Priscus by having two accents: ῷη and βάρς. The second element is the "young Altaic" word *bars* (< Iranian *pārs*), the common name for a large feline, e.g., leopard.[81] It often occurs as a personal name in the Bulgarian and Turkic worlds. As to the first element, Willy Bang-Kaup insisted that it should be connected with Turkic *oy* (< *ōy*), a word meaning "color of a horse's coat," rather than with the Turkic *ay* 'moon'.[82] Now there is better documentation available with regard to *ōy*; although definitions vary, they point mainly to "dun," thereby corroborating Bang's thesis:[83] *ōy-bárs* = "a dun feline."

11. Ἐσκάμ.[84] The first element of this composite Hunnic word is *es/äs* 'great, old', which is discussed below (nos. 13 and 30).[85] The second

[75] On *ō̆gä* and its etymology, see Clauson, *EDT*, p. 101; Doerfer, *TMEN*, 2: 614.
[76] See also Brockelmann, *OTG*, pp. 102-103 (§30).
[77] See Clauson, *EDT*, p. 192; Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 321-22; Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 46. Cf. also G. Doerfer and Semih Tezcan, *Wörterbuch des Chaladsch* (Budapest, 1980), p. 129.
[78] See Nadeljaev, *DTS*, p. 175.
[79] See Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, pp. 47-48.
[80] Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 148, l. 18 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 350. The initial ῷ- probably stands for ὦ-, cf. fn. 24.
[81] Clauson, *EDT*, p. 368. Cf. Doerfer, *TMEN*, 2: 235-38.
[82] W. Bang, "Über die türkischen Namen einiger Grosskatzen," *Keleti Szemle* (Budapest), 17 (1917): 112-14.
[83] Clauson, *EDT*, p. 266. I do not share Maenchen-Helfen's doubt about ὦη = *ōy*; see his *Huns*, pp. 418-19. I can also add that Priscus had reason to use the letter *omega* /ō/ with a circumflex in recording the Hunnic word with the vocalic length: *ōy*.
[84] Priscus, *EL*, ed. de Boor, p. 131, l. 2 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 126.
[85] On *es* 'great, old', see Pritsak, "Der Titel Attila" (fn. 1), pp. 414-15; G. J. Ramstedt, *Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Tschuwassischen* (Helsinki, 1922), p. 13, fn. 1; cf. Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 49.

part stands for the "Altaic" *qām* 'sorcerer, pagan priest';[86] the latter word also occurs in the name Ἀτακάμ (=*ata qām*, see no. 14). *Es qām* alone meant "the great priest." Apparently, Attila's father-in-law was a great priest among the Huns, as Teb Tenggri was among the Mongols of Chinggis qa'an (see *SH* §§244-246).

The initial *q-* in καμ *qām* had remained a stop (plosive); apparently, in Hunnic spirantization was limited to the absolute initial (see no. 6) and final (see no. 7) positions of the word. The initial consonant of the second component was treated just like a medial, i.e., [-s]+[x-] > *sq-*.

12. Βλήδα-. For this name Priscus gives the form Βλήδας[87] (= "Chronicon paschale," 7th c.: Βλίδας),[88] whereas Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes, not surprisingly, use a form without the Greek suffix -ς, i.e., *Bleda.*[89] In 1916 Willy Bang-Kaup wrote: "Ein Verbalnomen auf *-ta, -da* kennen wir nun bisher nicht; ich glaube aber annehmen zu müssen, dass ein solches auch dem koib. Imperative auf *-daq, -däk* < *-da-q, -dä-k* zugrunde liegt."[90] With the publication of Carl Brockelmann's "Glossary" to Kāšġarī in 1928, the deverbal nominal suffix /DA/ was well established, see e.g., *bük-* 'to bend, bow', and *bük-dä* (> *büg-dä*) 'crooked, bent [knife], dagger'; *küy-* 'burn': *kuy-dä* 'furnace'; *čaqir-* 'to call'; *čaqir-ta* (< *čaqirda*) 'envoy'.[91]

Hence we must interpret *Blida* as a deverbal noun in /dA/. In the root, *bli-*, it is easy to recognize the typical Hunno-Bulgarian vocalic metathesis *bli-* < **bil-*.[92] The verb *bil-* is well attested in Old Turkic and in all Turkic languages with the meaning "to know."[93] The Hunnic titlename **bildä* (> *blidä*) was apparently synonymous with the Old Turkic (already in the inscriptions) *bilgä* (*bil-gä*) 'wise; sovereign';[94] there the

[86] Clauson, *EDT*, p. 625; Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 228; Doerfer, *TMEN*, 3: 403-406. The Greek stress probably reflected the vocalic length; cf. also fn. 83.

[87] Priscus, *EL*, ed. de Boor, p. 121, l. 19; 122, l. 20, 131, l. 32, 132, l. 33, 133, l. 12, 145, l. 7 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 91-92.

[88] *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, p. 583, l. 15.

[89] Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, ed. Mommsen, p. 81 (*s.a.* 442, ch. X, 2; *s.a.* 445, ch. XIII, 1); Cassiodorus, *Chronica*, ed. Mommsen, *MGH AA*, vol. 11, p. 156; Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 159, l. 44; p. 160, l. 2.

[90] "Studien zur vergleichenden Grammatik der Türksprachen," *Sitzungsberichte der... Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. 37 (Berlin, 1916), p. 919.

[91] Brockelmann, *OTG*, p. 96 (§35), p. 140 (§118a); Räsänen, *Morphologie*, p. 119.

[92] On vocalic metathesis in Danube Proto-Bulgarian, see Pritsak, "The Proto-Bulgarian Military Inventory Inscriptions," in *Turkic-Bulgarian-Hungarian Relations* (Budapest, 1981), pp. 44, 48, 58.

[93] Clauson, *EDT*, pp. 330-31.

[94] See Pritsak, "Die 24 Ta-ch'ên," *Oriens Extremus*, 1:1 (Hamburg, 1954), pp. 186-87 = O. P., *Studies*, no. III.

Hunnic (non-productive?) suffix /DA/ had the same meaning as the Old Turkic non-productive suffix /GA/.

13. 'Αττίλα/*Attila*.[95] In 1955 I showed that 'Αττίλας/*Attila* should be analyzed as a composite title consisting of **es* 'great, old', **t¹il¹* 'sea, ocean', and the suffix /a/. The stressed back syllabic *tíl* (= *t¹il¹*) assimilated the front member *es*, so it became **as*.[96] The consonantic sequence *s-t* (*as̱ ṯil-*) became, due to metathesis, *t-s*, which by assimilation resulted in *tt*.[97] In 1981 I was able to establish a Danube-Bulgarian nominative-suffix /A/ from the consonantic stems.[98] Recalling that Danube-Bulgarian was a Hunnic language, I can now add to the data in the article of 1955 the following: the Hunnic title *attíla* is a nominative (in /A/) form of *attíl-* (< **etsíl* < **es tíl*) with the meaning "the oceanic, universal [ruler];" cf. the title of the Pečeneg ruler Куря, i.e., *Kür+ä*, meaning "universal" (cf. no. 3).

14-15. 'Ατακάμ[99] and Μάμα.[100] These two members of the Hunnic royal dynasty had fled to the Romans in wartime.[101] When a treaty was concluded in 435, the Romans handed over to the Huns the defectors'

[95] Αττίλας: Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 121, l. 18; p. 127, ll. 20, 24, 29, 32 et passim; Procopius, ed. Dewing, vol. 2, p. 40, l. 17; p. 42, ll. 7, 12, etc.; Ἀττιλᾶς: Joannes Malalas, ed. Dindorf, p. 358, ll. 8, 11, 15, etc. = *Byz. Tur*, 2: 79-80. *Attila*: Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, ed. Mommsen, p. 79, l. 5 et passim; see *MGH AA*, vol. 13, "Index nominum," s.v. Attila. Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 159, ll. 25, 32, 39, 41, 42 et passim; *Attyla*: "Anonymus Ravennas," ed. Schnetz, p. 67, l. 33; *Atala*^{abl} ~ *Atalum*^{acc}, "Historia Pseudoisidoriana" [ca. 1000], ed. Th. Mommsen, *MGH AA*, vol. 11, p. 384, ll. 5, 10.

[96] Pritsak, "Der Titel Attila" (see fn. 1), pp. 404-419.

[97] See, e.g., the sound change in Yakut: *st* > *ts* > *tt*: Yakut *sïttïq* < **ǯatsiq* < **yastuq*; cf. Räsänen, *Lautgeschichte*, p. 225, and Clauson, *EDT*, p. 974.

[98] Pritsak, "Proto-Bulgarian Military Inventory Inscriptions" (see fn. 92), p. 60.

[99] Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 122, l. 18 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 76.

[100] Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 122, l. 18 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 180-81.

[101] The text is ambiguous: ἐν οἷς καὶ παῖδες Μάμα καὶ 'Ατακάμ τοῦ Βασιλείου γένους. Therefore, two interpretations are found in the literature. C. D. Gordon translates it as: "Among them were the children Mama and Atakam, scions of the royal house" (*The Age of Attila* [Ann Arbor, 1966], p. 61), and this is also how E. A. Thompson understands the text (*A History of Attila and the Huns* [Oxford, 1948], p. 77: "two boys of Attila's own family named Mama and Atakam"). I follow Moravcsik, who regards Μάμα as [an apparently vulgar—O.P.] genitive from Μάμας (*Byz Tur*, 2: 180); see also the German translation of the passage by Ernst Doblhofer, *Byzantinische Diplomaten und östliche Barbaren* (Graz, 1955), p. 16: "... darunter die Söhne des Mama und Atakam, die dem Königshaus entstammten"; cf. the German translation by H. Homeyer (*Attila* [Berlin, 1951], p. 66). The very fact that the unhappy scions of the royal house were punished by crucifixion (οἱ παρειληφότες ἐσταύρωσαν, δίκας αὐτοὺς πραττόμενοι τῆς φυγῆς) may indicate that a change in religion (i.e., Christianity replacing the steppe religion) did in fact occur.

sons. They were later crucified in Carsum, a Thracian fortress, for their fathers' transgression.

14. The first name, Atakam (= *ata qā́m*), is readily analyzed: *ata* is comparable to Old Turkic (and Common Turkic) *ata* 'father';[102] about *qām* 'pagan priest', see no. 11.

15. Μάμα is apparently a popular version of the well-known Greek Christian name Μάμας (∼ Μάμα?),[103] and suggests that its bearer was a Christian — a circumstance which would probably have facilitated his defection to the Romans. It is remarkable that the names of both fugitives relate to religious matters: Ata-qā́m may have been the former chief priest (also a proselyte?), whereas Μάμας was most probably a Christian convert.

16. *Laudaricus*. The "Gallic Chronicle of 511" noted under the year 451 the death of a relative (*cognatus*) of Attila named *Laudaricus*, who was killed in the battle at Lacus Mauriacus.[104] The second part of this name is certainly the Gothic word *-ric* 'king'. Assuming that the first part, *Lauda-*, has been transmitted properly, M. Schönfeld suggested a Gothic etymology for the entire name: *Lauda reiks*.[105]

But it is possible, at least theoretically, that the source of the chronicle (or its compiler) "Gothicized" the name. He might have had before him **Valda-* ∼ *Velda* (< **Belda* > *Bleda*), which he "corrected" into *Lauda*, or copied with a metathesis (*Lau-* for **ual-*); cf. no. 18: χιρ > ριχ.

17-19. *Ellac*, Δεγγιζίχ, and 'Ηρνάχ/*Hernac*, the names of the three oldest sons of Attila, must have had symbolic meanings.

17. The term *ēl* > *īl* (the etymon of *Ellac*)[106] was the designation for the nomadic steppe *pax* in the Old Turkic inscriptions of the first half of the eighth century found in Mongolia.[107] One can assume that the same term, with the same meaning, also existed in the Hunnic language.

Old Turkic has the (denominal) suffix /lAG/, going back to the

[102] I do not agree with Doerfer (*CAJ* 17 [1973]: 21; cf. also his *TMEN*, 2: 5-7) when he states that there is no sure evidence of *ata* prior to the eleventh century. To the data from the Uighur Buddhist texts from the eighth century quoted by Clauson (*EDT*, p. 40), one can add several other appearances of *ata* in the eighth-century *Maitrisimit*; see Şinasi Tekin, *Maitrisimit nom bitig*, vol. 2 ([East] Berlin, 1980), p. 17.

[103] On St. Mamas, see, e.g., A. Maraba-Xatzenikolau, 'Ο ἅγιος Μάμας (Athens, 1953).

[104] ed. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* 1, p. 66, l. 615.

[105] Schönfeld, *Wörterbuch*, p. 277.

[106] Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 173, l. 28.

[107] Clauson, *EDT*, pp. 121-122. Cf. Doerfer, *TMEN*, 1: 142 and 2: 194-201, 210-13. On the Azeri form *ellik* 'narodnyj, obščestvennyj, etc.', see Doerfer, *TMEN*, 4: 266.

denominal verbal suffix /lA/, enlarged by the deverbal nominal ending /G/, e.g., OT *baš* 'head': *baš+la-* 'to begin': *baš+la-ġ* 'beginning'.[108]

One can assume a comparable situation for the Hunnic: **el* 'realm': **el+lä-* 'to rule': **el+lä-g* 'the rule'. Also, in this word the final *c* in the Latin notation must represent the final Hunnic *-g*.

18. Δεγγιζίχ[109] has the abbreviated variant Διν[γι]ζιχ[110] > *Den[git]zic-*,[111] *Din[gi]tzic.*[112] The word has the denominal suffix /čiG/ (see OT /čiG/ ~ /siG/ and Hunnic /siG/, no. 2), meaning "like."[113] Before this suffix (in Priscus's notation) the final /r/ of the stem was dropped.[114] But this /r/ was retained in the Greek notation of Marcellinus Comes (A.D. 534) and taken over (with some change) by the "Chronicon paschale" (ca. 628):

Marcellinus (p. 90 b, l. 5) Διυζίχιρος (cf. his Latin form *Denzic*; p. 90a, l. 7);

"Chronicon paschale": Διυζίριχος (the χιρ of Marcellinus became ριχ).

As we can readily see, the order of syllables in Marcellinus was disturbed. I propose to treat his Greek -ζίχ in the same way as his Latin *-zic-*, i.e., as a suffix, and to transfer it to the end of the name (the Greek suffix -ος, must, of course, be disregarded). The result is the form *Διυιρζίχ. In Marcellinus's Latin notation the middle syllable *-gi-* was missing (see above), whereas to the Greek notation only γ must be added. The restored form, then, is *Διυγιρζίχ. The name should be reconstructed as *deŋir+čig* > *deŋičig* (cf. OT *teŋəz* 'sea' and OMo [ḥPʻags-pa] *dėŋri* 'heaven'),[115] with the meaning "ocean-like." Hence the name of the son belongs to the same semantic field as that of the father (Attila; see no. 13). The form **deŋir* is remarkable because of its rhotacism.

108 von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 61 (§ 52).

109 Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 588, ll. 6, 24, 28 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 117.

110 *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, p. 598, l. 3: Διυζίριχος. The text has two other variants (see *Byz Tur*, 2: 117): Διυζίχ and Διυζίχος.

111 Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, ed. Mommsen, p. 90, a, b.

112 Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 175, l. 28.

113 See von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 66 (§ 80); Räsänen, *Morphologie*, p. 111.

114 I see here a development parallel to that observed in Turkic Mongolian, where stems ending with *-r*, *-l*, *-n* drop their final consonant before some suffixes, e.g., Turkic: qa*r*+daš 'friend, fellow' > qa+*daš* 'id',; see W. Bang, "Schwund von -r-," in *Keleti Szemle* 18 (1919): 18-19; Mongolian: *dabu-*r* > dabu+*sun* 'salt'; see Pritsak, "Mongolisch *yisün* 'neun' und *yiren* 'neunzig,'" *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* (Wiesbaden), 26 (1954): 243-45.

115 Poppe, *The Mongolian Monuments in ḥPʻags-pa Script* (Wiesbaden, 1957), p. 122.

19. Attila's beloved youngest son was by his queen Krekän. It was this son that soothsayers prophesied would restore the Hunnic realm to greatness. Three variants of his name appear in the sources: Ἠρνάχ,[116] Ирнихъ,[117] and *Hernac*.[118] It has been suggested that the name should be connected with the Turkic *erŋäk* ~ *ernäk* 'finger, thumb'.[119] Some time ago I expressed another opinion: the etymon here is *erän*, the "irregular" plural of *ēr* 'man', with the meaning "real man, a man squared, hero."[120] But there is actually no problem here, since *erŋäk* ~ *ernäk* is a diminutive of *erän* (*er+än*): *erän* + diminutive suffix /G Ak/ or /AK/: *er+än+gäk* > *erŋäk*: *ar+än+äk* > *ernäk*).[121] The word *erän* must have had two oppositional meanings: "real man, hero" and "small man." The latter meaning is found in Kāšġarī's dictionary: through a denominal suffix the verb *erän+ge-* was created, in which the noun in /u/ *erän+gä-yü* had the meaning "a very small (short = Arab. *qaṣīr*) man, two cubits tall." But *erängäyü* also had the meaning "a man with six fingers (Arab. *lahu sitta aṣābi'*),"[122] which probably also meant "lucky man."

The "Altaic" etymology of the Turkic word *erŋäk* (< *erän+gäk*) ~ *ernäk* (< *ērän*+diminutive suffix /AK/), as elaborated by N. Poppe, proves that the word in fact goes back to *ēr* 'man', since originally it had *h-* in the initial position (like *er* < *hǟr*, *her*, etc.): MMo *heregai* 'thumb' (cf. Mo *ere* 'man' = tü. *ēr* id.), Manchu *ferxe* 'id', Orok *pero(n-)* 'id', etc.[123]

Since Jordanes writes the name of Attila's third son with an initial *h-* (*Hernac*), the spiritus *lenis* of the Greek form should be corrected into a spiritus *asper*, i.e., ἠ into ἡ. The name *hērnǟk*, having the oppositional meanings "hero" and "little [i.e., lucky?] man," was especially fitting for Attila's beloved son.

20. *Emnetzur*,[124] 24. Ἐλμίγγειρος,[125] 25. Ἐλμινζούρ.[126] These three

[116] Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 588, l. 8 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 132.
[117] Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, pp. 36-37.
[118] Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 174, l. 20.
[119] See, e.g., Franz Altheim, *Attila und die Hunnen* (Baden-Baden, 1951), p. 155. On *erŋäk* ~ *ernäk*, see Clauson, *EDT*, p. 234; *Räsänen*, *EWT*, p. 46; Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 299.
[120] Pritsak, "Stammesnamen und Titulaturen der altaischen Völker," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 24, nos. 1-2 (1952): 70-71, and my remark in Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, p. 415. Cf. Clauson, *EDT*, p. 232 (s.v. *eren*).
[121] von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 62 (§§ 59 and 57).
[122] Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 157.
[123] Poppe, *Vgl Gr Alt*, pp. 11, 79. Concerning *hēr*, see Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 46; Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 321-22; Pritsak (fn. 92), p. 60; cf. Cincius, *Sravn Slov Tung*, 2: 354.
[124] Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 174, l. 21.
[125] Agathias, ed. Dindorf, p. 275, l. 8 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 123.
[126] Agathias, ed. Dindorf, p. 314, l. 31; p. 315, l. 7 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 123.

names belong together, although they refer to two different persons: *Emnetzur* (no. 20) and *Vltzindur* (no. 23) were *consanguinei*, or brothers, of Attila's son Hernac, i.e., sons of Attila; Ἐλμίγγειρ- (no. 24), also called Ἐλμινζούρ (no. 25), was a progeny of Attila's dynasty who was active in 556. Two suffixes in the three names can easily be determined: *-tzur* = -ζουρ [čür] and -γειρ [gir]. The latter is known in Danube-Bulgarian, where it appears as a suffix in tribal names: e.g., Κουριγηρ (=*küri+gir*).[127] The suffix /+čUr/ can be compared with the Mongolian collective suffix /+čUd/ (= /čU/+/d/),[128] where /d/ is the plural affix, in Hunno-Bulgarian having the correspondence /r/; see *Balamu+r* (no. 1).

The etymon is **elmin* (*elmin+čǘr*) with its variant **emnin* (< **emlin* > **emnin* > *emnə[n]* [> *emnə[n]+čür* > *emnə+čür*) 'horse' (in the twelve animal cycle; also a tribal name), known from the Danube Proto-Bulgarian.[129] In Volga-Bulgarian and in Chuvash the cluster *-nč-* is often simplified into *š*, e.g., الطش *altiši*[130] (< **altinči*). Therefore, the form *emnečür* goes back to **emnen+čür*; cf. *elmin+čǘr*.

The persons in question apparently also bore their clan name as a personal name: *Elmin+čǘr* > *Emnečür*, or the tribal name *Elmin+gir*. The nameforms were obviously interchangeable, since both the form Ἐλμίγγειρ (*elmín+gir*) and Ἐλμινζούρ (*Elmin+čǘr*) (occurring in A.D. 556) sseem to relate to one and the same person, as the editors (Niebuhr and Stein) of Agathias's work — where the two forms appear — have suggested.[131] See also the name Δονάτ-, above, no. 5.

21. *Vltzindur*.[132] This name contains another clan (tribal) suffix, /DUr/, parallelling the suffix /čUr/; the latter is also attested in the name Οὐλτινζούρ (*öltin+čǘr*).[133]

The etymon is the Hunnic ruler's name discussed above: *ǿldin* (see no. 4). In the notations under discussion, the change *ld* > *lt* > *lč* had already taken place; the parallel development is known from the Volga-

[127] See Karl H. Menges, "Altaic Elements in the Proto-Bulgarian Inscriptions," *Byzantion* 21 (1951): 102-106.

[128] See Poppe, *MCS*, pp. 181, 183. On the VBulg collective suffix *-č*, see Pritsak, "Tschuwaschische Pluralsuffixe," in *Studia Altaica* (= *Festschrift N. Poppe*) (Wiesbaden, 1957), pp. 139-40, 144-46.

[129] Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, pp. 67-68.

[130] F. S. Xakimzjanov, *Jazyk èpitafij volžskix Bulgar* (Moscow, 1978), p. 124 (pl. 12), l. 7. Cf. the development in Yakut: OT *sanč* > *as*. On Yak. *as-* 'to pierce', see W. Bang, "Turkologische Briefe...V," *Ungarische Jahrbücher* (Berlin), 10 (1930): 18-19.

[131] On this, see Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, p. 402.

[132] Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 174, l. 22.

[133] Agathias, ed. Dindorf, p. 365. Cf. *Byz Tur*, 2: 230.

Bulgarian inscriptions, e.g., بلج *bolči* (< *bolti* < *bol-di*),[134] الت *elti* > الچى *elči* 'lady'.[135] The name has to be interpreted, therefore, as *ölčindür*.

The very fact that the known tribal clan suffixes occur only with the names *Öldin* and *Elmín* may suggest that the European Huns designated themselves by the names of two ancestors, *Öldin* and *Elmín* (~ *Donát*). This brings to mind the two ancestors of the Türküt-Turks as they are styled in the Orkhon inscriptions: Bumən qağan and Istämi qağan.

22. Γιέσμ-.[136] According to Theophanes's chronicle (ca. 814), this person was the father of *Mundo* (no. 23), who in turn is characterized as a descendant of Attila.

There was initially a *g*- in the Hunno-Bulgarian languages: e.g., the Danube-Bulgarian ruler's name Гостоун-/*Gostun*,[137] Old Bulgarian > Hungarian: *görény* 'polecat', etc.[138] Therefore, in my view the word γιέσμ- should be interpreted as having the initial Hunnic *g*-, that is, as **gésəm*.

My thesis here is that in this word the Hunnic *g*- corresponds to the Turkic-Chuvash-Mongolian *k*- in *kes/käs* (> Čuv *kas*), where, due to regressive dissimilation in the sequence **g-s* (**ges*), it was replaced by the voiceless *k*- (= *g-s* > *k-s*).[139]

Mongolian has a term *kesig*, for which Ferdinand D. Lessing's dictionary gives the following meanings: [1*] "grace, favor, blessing"; [2] "good luck or good fortune"; [3] "turn (one's place, time, or opportunity in a scheduled or alternating order)."[140] To this one should add [as 4] "gift, present."[141]

The Yakuts borrowed this Mongolian word in the form *käsī* (< *kesig*) with the meaning [4] "small gift, present not requiring a gift in return,"[142] and the word entered (via Yakut?) the majority of the

[134] Xakimzjanov (see fn. 130), p. 135 (pl. 17), l. 7.
[135] Xakimzjanov (see fn. 130), p. 91.
[136] Theophanes, ed. de Boor, p. 218, l. 32 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 113-14.
[137] Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, pp. 15, 35.
[138] András Róna-Tas, "The Character of Hungarian-Bulgaro-Turkic Relations," in *Turkic-Bulgarian-Hungarian Relations* (Budapest, 1981), pp. 126, 127.
[139] On the sporadic disagreements between Volga-Bulgarian, Turkic, and Mongolian, such as voicing *versus* devoicing of consonants in the initial position, see Róna-Tas (fn. 138), pp. 126-27 and esp. fn. 24 (on p. 127).
* *The numeration is mine — O.P.*
[140] Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 460.
[141] See the derivation *kesig+le*- in Lessing's *Dictionary*, p. 460: "to give presents; to confer favors; to do in turns." Cf. also Poppe, *Vgl Gr Alt*, p. 65.
[142] Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 1061.

Tunguz languages, e.g., Negidal *käsī*, Udihe, Ulcha, Orok, Manchu *käsi*, with the meanings: [1] "favor, blessing"; [2] "luck, good luck"; [4] "gift."[143]

The Mongolian word is a deverbal noun in /g/ from the Proto-Mongolian root **kesi-*,[144] which ultimately goes back to the noun *kes*, which (as will be shown below) also left traces in Turkic and Chuvash.

The "Altaic" verb **gesi-* > **kesi-* (= **kes+i–*)[145] can be established on the basis of Ottoman (dialectal) *kesimiş* (= *käs+i–miš*) [4] 'wedding present (götürü iş)'.[146] The deverbal suffix /miš/ goes back to an expansion of the deverbal noun /m/, that is, /miš/ = /m/+/iš/.[147]

On this basis, we can accept — theoretically, at least — that from the verb *käsi-*, in addition to the derived form in /g/ there was also a derived form in /m/.

While there are no traces of the deverbal form in /g/ from *käsi-* in the Turkic languages or in Chuvash — the Bashkir (*Bašk* 254) *kïsï* (< **käsī*) in *kïsïlïk* (semantically, a response to meanings [1, 2, 4]) 'reverence' is certainly a borrowing ultimately from Mongolian *kesig* — Ottoman (Old Ottoman and the dialects) does have the anticipated form *kesim* (= *käs+i–m*) with the meaning "deal; agreement (pazarlık; anlaşma)."[148] Apparently, agreement between two parties was originally based on the exchange of gifts (meaning [4]).

In Chuvash culture there is a ceremonial wedding soup — apparently bestowing "blessing" [1] and "good luck" [2] — called *kasmăk jaški*.[149] The first component of the Chuvash term corresponds exactly to the Ottoman ((dialectal) *kesme aşı*/*kesme çorbası*[150] (Čuv *jaška*, and Ottoman *aş* and *çorba* mean "soup"). Both forms, Chuvash *kasmăk* (= *kas+măk* < *käsi-mäk*) and Ottoman *kesme* (= *kes-me* < *kes-mek* < **kesi-mäk*), go back to the verb *kesi-*, augmented with the suffix /mAK/

143 See Cincius, *Sravn Slov Tung*, 1: 455. I cannot dwell here on the Mongolian *kesig* = Turkic *käzig* 'sentry, guard', about which see Paul Pelliot, "Notes sur le 'Turkestan' de M. W. Barthold," *T'oung Pao* (Leiden), 27 (1930): 28-31; Antoine Mostaert, *Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), pp. 374-80; Doerfer, *TMEN*, 1 (1963): 467-70.

144 On the suffix /g/, see Szabó, *Szóképzés*, p. 43, § 105.

145 On the denominal verbal suffix /i/, see Ramstedt, *Einführung*, 2 (1952): 201-202 (§11) and von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 66 (§85).

146 *Derleme sözlüğü* (Ankara), 8 (1975): 2765.

147 On the deverbal suffix /miš/ see Ramstedt, *Einführung*, 2: 106.

148 *Tarama sözlüğü* (Ankara), 4 (1969): 2447-49; *Derleme sözlüğü* 8 (1975): 2764.

149 Ašmarin, *Thesaurus* 6 (1934): 128, where the Chuvash word is treated as inexplicable.

150 *Derleme sözlüğü*, 8: 2764.

~ /mA/;[151] the originally three-syllable word (**kesimäk*) lost its middle syllable, which was unstressed (Bang's "Mittelsilbenschwund"), and became: *kesmäk* (> Čuv *kasmăk*).

Since the deverbal suffix /mAk/– like the suffix /miš/– consists of two elements: /m/ and /Ak/, the data presented here confirm further the occurrence of the deverbal suffix /m/ with the root **kesi-* in both Turkic and Chuvash.

The root *kes*, a term which — as its semantic fields indicate — derived from the religious and social life of the Eurasian steppe, has survived (if somewhat limited or transformed in semantics) in the Karakhanid language (11th century), Old Ottoman (and in Turkey in Turkish dialects), Yakut, Chuvash, and Written Mongolian.

The Karakhanid meanings encompass three groups, the semantics of which are clearly influenced by the Islamic religion and Bedouin customs. So, obligatory ablution has influenced the semantic change *käs* — [Arab] *an-nubla*, that is, "a piece of dried clay ([Arab] *al-madāra*) with which one cleans oneself [after passing water],"[152] certainly in order to be ready to receive [1] "grace, favor, blessing."

Because of meanings [1] and [2] ("good luck and good fortune"), a person was *käs* 'quick-minded, expeditious',[153] and because of [4] ("gift, present"), one was full of *käsgü* (= *käs+gü*) 'praise';[154] cf. the Bashkir data above.

Two words in particular should be regarded as resulting from meaning [4]: *käs* 'a piece' (originally 'of a gift'?)[155] and *kästäm* (*käs+täm*) 'an entertainment with drinks, other than a formal banquet, which a man gives to visitors at night'.[156]

In Old Ottoman (15th century), probably due to the influence of despotic rule, semantics concentrate on the agent of the meanings [1-4]. There *kes* is "owner; protector, helper (sahip, hamî, yardımcı),"[157] and

[151] On these suffixes see Ramstedt, *Einführung*, 2: 106, and Räsänen, *Morphologie*, pp. 133-35.

[152] Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 262.

[153] Radloff, *Wb*, vol. 2, col. 1154; Nadeljaev, *DTS*, p. 302.

[154] Semantic interpretation of this word is based on the meaning of the word اوكدى *ögdi* 'praise', with which the Ferghana manuscript of the *Qutadġu Bilig* (facsimile ed. [Istanbul, 1943], p. 30, l. 5) replaces *käsgü* of the Herat manuscript of *QB* (facs. [Istanbul, 1942], p. 18, l. 23).

Concerning the denominal suffix /GU/, see von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 62 (§60). There was still another word, *käsgü* 'piece', in the Karakhanid language, but it does not belong here, because it is a deverbal noun /GU/ from *käs-* 'to cut', as Kāšġarī correctly explains. Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 75.

[155] Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 262.

[156] Kāšġarī/facs., p. 244. Cf. Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 360.

[157] *Tarama sözlüğü*, 4: 2443.

then he is "decisive."[158] On the other hand, the object of this active element is *kes* as with the meaning "dumbfounded, confused";[159] hence, also the abstraction *käs* 'confusion'.[160] The Ottoman and Chuvash dialects have a depreciated meaning [4] already influenced by agricultural practices: *kes* or *kes+bik* (= Čuv *kas+pik*) 'huge [pressed] straw and fire made of it' [as a gift?—O.P.].[161] The word occurs already in the Old Ottoman texts (15th-18th centuries), in the forms *kesmik* ~ *kesmük* (= *kesi-m* + /Uk/), with the following four meanings: "bounded huge straw (boğumlu iri saman)"; "ears of grain, remaining apart during the harvest because of insufficient threshing (harmanda fena dövülmekten taneli kalmış başak)"; "end of the threshing season (harman sonu)"; "dog collar made of wood (ağaçtan yapılan köpek haltası, tok, tasma)."[162]

In Yakut the term was recorded in three instances: *käskil* (= *käs+kil*) [2] "good-luck, fate; commandment, rule";[163] *käs*, as the result of [1] ("grace, favor, blessing"), means "sacred, intimate." Meaning [4] ("gift") is apparently responsible for *käs*, as an attribute to *ïnax* 'cow', acquiring the meaning "calved cow," that is, "cow with a gift."[164]

The Mongolian and Chuvash meanings of *kes* (> *kas*) are semantically connected with *kesig*'s third meaning, "turn": Written Mongolian *kes* 'advance abruptly, in a decisive manner; suddenly; off (with verbs meaning breaking or tearing)';[165] Chuvash *kas* 'part, stripe, segment of time'.[166]

In the "Altaic" languages deverbal nouns in /g/ usually designate the results of action, whereas in Turkic and Chuvash the suffix /m/[167] is used for abstracta or an agent of action, for instance, Turkic *öl-üg* 'dead' and *öl-üm* 'death', *al-ig* 'duty' and *al-im* 'debt'.[168]

The original meaning of the Hunnic **gesm* < **gėsəm* (< **ges+i−m*)

[158] Redhouse, 1545 > Radloff, *Wb*, vol. 2, col. 1154.
[159] Redhouse, 1545 > *New Redhouse* (1968), p. 642 (*kes* 4).
[160] Radloff, *Wb*, vol. 2, cols. 1153-54 [¹käs, 1].
[161] *Derleme sözlüğü*, 8: 2759-60. See fn. 149.
[162] *Tarama sözlüğü*, 4: 2453-54.
[163] Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 1063. On the denominal nominal suffix /Gil/, see Räsänen, *Morphologie*, p. 103.
[164] Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 1059.
[165] Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 459.
[166] Ašmarin, *Thesaurus*, 6: 127.
[167] On the deverbal suffix /m/ in Chuvash, see N. A. Andreev in *Materialy po grammatike sovremennogo čuvašskogo jazyka*, vol. 1: *Morfologija* (Čeboksary, 1957), p. 50.
[168] See, e.g., Räsänen, *Morphology*, pp. 122-23 (/g/), and p. 133 (/m/). The examples quoted here are taken from Nadeljaev, *DTS*, p. 384 (*öl-*), and Brockelmann, *OTG*, p. 101 (*al-iġ*) and p. 124 (*al-im*).

was probably "protector, bestower of favor, blessing, good-fortune, etc." This was certainly a suitable name for a Hunnic prince still cognizant of his family's high origin and exceptional historical role.

23. Μοῦνδο-[169]/*Mundo*.[170] This name is, in my opinion, the "abbreviated" form of the designation of Attila's father, discussed above (no. 7). While Μουνδίουχ **Munǯúq* was already the "Hunnicized" version of the Chinese loanword, the form Μοῦνδο- (see also the variant Μουνδίο, no. 7) better reflects the original **múnǯu* (see no. 7).

It is remarkable that one of the last known members of Attila's clan bore the name of Attila's father.

24. *Elmingir*, 25. *Elminčür*. See no. 20.

II. Names of Leading Hunnic Statesmen and Officers ca. A.D. 448-449.

26. 'Αδάμις.[171] When the Roman embassy came to the court of Attila (ca. 449), its members were all also invited by Krekän, the Hunnic queen, to dine at the home of 'Αδάμει^{dat}, who was described by Priscus as the steward in charge of the queen's affairs. Since in medieval Eurasian societies such a position was usually held by an eunuch, we can speculate that the "name" 'Αδάμ- was actually an appellative meaning "eunuch."

A Turkic word already known from Kāšġarī's "Dictionary" (1077) occurs there without any other relatives: *atan*, meaning "a gelded camel."[172] The word and its meaning were later borrowed into Mongolian.[173]

Since some Turkic languages use *atan* as an attribute to a word meaning "camel"—e.g., *Kirg* 79 *atan tȫ* (*tȫ* 'camel'), *Nog* 52, *KKlp* 59 *atan tüyä* (*tüyä* 'camel')—*atan* only elliptically acquired the meaning "a gelded camel": originally it was doubtlessly an adjective meaning "gelded." This interpretation is also given by Èrvand V. Sevortjan in his Turkic etymological dictionary.[174]

[169] Procopius, ed. Dewing, vol. 1, p. 232, ll. 15, 21, 30; Joannes Malalas, ed. Dindorf, p. 450, l. 19; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, p. 218, ll. 31-32 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 194.
[170] Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, ed. Mommsen, p. 96, l. 23; p. 103, l. 5; Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 180, ll. 8, 11, 12.
[171] Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 146, l. 8 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 56.
[172] Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 114. On Turkic *atan* see Clauson, *EDT*, p. 60; Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 31; Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 202-203.
[173] Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 58: *ata(n)* 'castrated camel'; Ramstedt, *KWb*, p. 17; see Clauson, *EDT*, p. 60. Ramstedt's etymology—Mo *ata(n)*: tü *at*—is certainly wrong; see his *Einführung*, 1: 153 and 2: 120.
[174] Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 202-203.

Only the manuscripts of Ibn Muhannā (14th century) have two other forms, *atġān* and *ataġān*, for "a gelded camel."[175] Sevortjan explains all three forms—*atan*, *atġān*, and *ataġān*—as derivations from the hypothetical verb *at-* 'to geld, castrate'.[176] This etymology requires some elaboration and correction.

In Yakut there is a verb *attā-*, meaning "to put, lighten, castrate, geld."[177] The word is a denominal verb in /DA/ (~ /LĀ/) from the unattested nominal stem **ad*.[178] The form *atan* had the following history, in my view.

Old Turkic developed a strong dislike for geminatae, for example, *dd*, presuming the first *d* was the ending of the stem and the second *d* was the initial letter of the suffix. In such a case, the following happened: *d-d* > **dt* > *t*, e.g., (IS12, I E7, II E7, II N14) *it*^{1}*i* 'he sent' (< **id-di*); (II E40, To 33, To 52 etc.) *it*^{1}*əm* 'I sent' (< **id-dəm*); the verbal root was *id*^{1}- 'to send'.

Hence the form *atan* should be explained as a deverbal noun in /n/[179] from the verb **ad+da-*: **adda-n* > *atan*.

Later (in the 14th century) *atan* was interpreted (due to the popular etymology) as an "Oghuz Turkic" participial form in /An/, and two Qipčaq Turkic corresponding forms were created in which the given suffix had an initial gutural /GAn/ or /AGAN/. I interpret the forms in the manuscripts of Ibn Muhannā's work in the following way.

In Turkic the deverbal nominal suffixes /n/ and /m/ were often used interchangeably in the same function (verbal abstracta or adjectiva), e.g., *igr-in* = *igr-im* 'act of twisting, whirlpool'.[180]

Apart from the common Turkic denominal verbal suffix /dA/ ~ /lĀ/, there also existed, in the same function, the suffix /A/.

[175] ed. Platon Melioranskij, *Arab filolog o tureckom jazyke* (St. Petersburg, 1900), p. 048 (اطغان); Ibn Muhannā, ed., *Kilisli Rifat* (Istanbul, 1340/1920-21), p. 172 = Aptullah Battal, *Ibnü-Mühennâ lûgatı* (Istanbul, 1934), p. 13.

[176] Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 202.

[177] Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 195. In Yakut the root final *-d* developed into *-t*, e.g., Old Turkic *ad-aq* 'foot' (= Ottoman etc. *ay-aq*, Yakut *at-ax*); see Räsänen, *Lautgeschichte*, pp. 162-64.

[178] On the suffix /DA/, see von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 69 (§102), Brockelmann, *OTG*, pp. 216-17, 223; Räsänen, *Morphologie*, p. 145; cf. /DA/ in Mongolian, Szabó, *Szóképzés*, pp. 36-37 (§77).

Yakut has only one denominal verbal suffix /LĀ/ ~ /TĀ/, i.e., the suffix /DA/ and LĀ/ merged; see L. N. Xaritonov, *Tipy glagol'noj osnovy v jakutskom jazyke* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1954), pp. 91-121. As an example of the merger, see Turkic *yol+da-š-* 'to unify' = Yakut *suollas* (< *suol+lā-š-*); also see Piekarski, vol. 3, col. 2344.

[179] On the deverbal suffix /n/, see Räsänen, *Morphologie*, p. 138.

[180] Brockelmann, *OTG*, p. 129 (igri-*n*), p. 124 (igri-*m*), from *egir-* 'to surround, encircle, twist, spin' (Clauson, *EDT*, p. 113). On /n/ and /m/ suffixes in Mongolian, see Szabó, *Szóképzés*, p. 45 (§§109, 110).

From these data I conclude that in both Turkic and Hunnic, there was a verb with the meaning "to castrate, geld" from the nominal base **ad*.

In Turkic the denominal verbal suffix /dA/ and the deverbal nominal suffix /n/ were used to convey the meaning "castrated; gelded" (**ad+da-n > atan*).

Hunnic used, for the same purpose, the denominal verbal suffix /A/ and the deverbal nominal suffix /m/. The result was **ad+a-m = adám*.

The Hunnic dignitary in charge of the queen's household was, indeed, a eunuch, as his "name"—i.e., official title—corroborates. His position could be compared to that of the *qizlar aġasi* in the Ottoman empire.

Establishment of the Hunnic word *adám* with the medial *-d-* is of great significance, because this illustrates one of the basic distinctive features in Turkic and Altaic language classifications. It is apparent that the change *-d- > -r-* was late; hence it was not Hunnic, but Bulgarian (first attested in the 9th century). See also no. 28, Ἐδέκων.

27. Βέριχος.[181] He was an important *logas*, or minister (ca. 449), of Attila who was also of high Hunnic origin.

Since the Hunnic final *-q* and *-k* had a tendency toward spirantization (see nos. 6, 7), the name should be interpreted phonologically as **bérik*. This same form is suggested by È. V. Sevortjan as the original for the very popular Turkic adjective and name *berk* 'fine, stable, solid, strong'.[182] The form *berik* is also attested in the glossary of Ibn Muhannā (14th century)[183] and in the legend of Oghuz Qaġan (13th century).[184] The word was borrowed into Mongolian, where it became *berke*,[185] since in the final position of a stem Mongolian allows no voiceless stops.

The Mongolian loanword (which, incidentally, entered into Chuvash as *parka < berke*)[186] was also used as a personal name, e.g., Berke, the second khan of the Golden Horde (1257-1266), who converted to Islam.

The appellation *bérik* 'strong' is certainly a reasonable one for a responsible Hunnic leader.

181 Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 143, l. 25; p. 147, ll. 10, 21; p. 147, l. 28; p. 148, ll. 1, 8 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 89-90.
182 Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 2: 116-20, esp. 119.
183 ed. Melioranskij, *Arab filolog* (see fn. 175), p. 80.
184 W. Bang and G. R. Rahmeti [Arat], *Oğuz kağan destanı* (Istanbul, 1936), p. 20, l. 176.
185 Already attested to in the *SH*: *berke* 'difficult, severe'; see Haenisch, *Wörterbuch*, p. 15, and Clauson, *EDT*, pp. 361-62. On the structure of the Mongolian syllable, see Ramstedt, *Einführung*, 2: 18-19.
186 See Egorov, *ÈSČJ*, p. 143.

28. 'Εδέκων.[187] This Hun was one of "Attila's most powerful lieutenants" and served as ambassador to the Roman emperor in 449.

The second part of his name, -κων, derives from the deverbal noun /GUN/ (like -κων of Ζερ-κων); the initial *-k* of this suffix indicates that originally the stem ended in /r/ which is also responsible for the change of **g-* into *k-* (as in ζερ-κων): /r-g/ > /r-k/ ~ /k/.[188]

In this way we arrive at the verbal root *edär-*, which is well known in Turkic from the eighth century on, usually with *-d-* already developed into *-y-* (> *-g-*, etc.). The verb's basic meaning was "to pursue, to follow."[189]

Several Turkic languages use derivational forms of this verb. These are grouped below according to their suffixes:

(a) /GUči/: *NUig* 76 *ägäš-küči*[190] 'adherent';
(b) /GUč/: *Kzk* 143, *KKlp* 195 *yer-giš*[191] 'dependent, complaisant, unsteady';
(c) /iGči/: *Tkm* 777 *eyär-iǯi* 'follower'; *Tat* 184 *iyär-üwčĭ* 'follower, devotee', *iyär-üwčĭlĭk* 'imitation'; *Bašk* 678 *eyär-ĭwsĭ* 'follower, imitator';
(d) /iGčAn/: *Tat* 184 *iyär-üwčän* 'imitative', *iyär-üwčänlĭk* 'imitation';
(e) čAŋ/ ~ /čin/: *Tkm* 777 *eyär–ǯäŋ* 'fellow-traveler'; *Bašk* 679 *eyär–sĭn* 'adherent, follower'; *Tat* 184 *iyär–čĭn* 'fellow-traveler, follower, confederate';
(f) /inči/: *Tuv* 576 *edär-inči* 'fellow traveler';
(g) /mA/: *Tat* 184 *iyär–mä* 'retinue'; *NUig* 76 *ägäš–mä* 'following'.

Interestingly enough, Chuvash has the same suffix /GUn/ (< -GU + n) as Hunnic does; but there the original stem was replaced by a Turkic one of the Kazakh type: *jer-kăn* (/*kăn*/ < /GUn/) 'lover'.[192]

187 Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 122, l. 28; p. 123, ll. 1, 20, 29, 31, 34; p. 124, ll. 2, 5, 6, 8, etc. = *Byz Tur*, 2: 121.
188 Danube Proto-Bulgarian of the ninth century has documented the change *r-d* > *t*: δυγε-τοιγη *dügä-tügi* < **düger-dügi*; see Pritsak, *Fürstenliste*, p. 88. To the Turkic change *r-g* > *rk*, see, e.g., Kāšġ. *tergi* 'a portable table': *CC tirki*, Kāšġ. *tergü* 'saddle-straps': Old Ottoman *terki* (data in Clauson, *EDT*, p. 544). To the Turkic change *rk* > *k*, see, e.g., *erkän* > Ottoman *iken*, data in Clauson, *EDT*, pp. 224-25. On devoicing after *r*, *l*, *n*, see no. 31.
189 See Clauson, *EDT*, p. 67; Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 36; Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 242-45.
190 New Uighur special development: *edär-* > *eyär-* > *eyäš-* (cf. Lobnor *eyäš-* 'to follow'; Sergej E. Malov, *Lobnorskij jazyk* [Frunze, 1956], p. 107). See also Kumandu *äš-* 'to follow' (Nikolaj A. Baskakov, *Dialekt Kumandincev* [Moscow, 1972], p. 276) < *egäš-*.
191 *Kzk*, *Kklp*. form *yer-* developed from *iyär-* < *edär-*.
192 Ašmarin, *Thesaurus*, 4: 285-86.

Our conclusion is that the Hunnic "name" was actually an appellative derived from the deverbal noun **edắkün* (< **edär-kün*). The meaning of the word was very probably "follower, retainer."

29. Ζέρκων.[193] The bearer of this name — or, better, title — was not a member of the dynasty of Attila, but a Moorish dwarf and buffoon of the king Blída. From Priscus's stories it is clear that Ζέρκων was not his real name, but a sobriquet given to the clown by his capricious master. The final /n/ is the "plural of quantity," comparable to Mongolian (e.g., Urdus) /n/ in tribal names.[194] Without the suffix /n/ the word occurs in a Danube-Bulgarian name list in Latin script from 869-870 as *zerco*.[195] It has long been recognized as an abbreviated variant of the Danube-Bulgarian title ἠτζιργου *ičirgü* 'the inner [residence] official', i.e.,[196] *íč+i-r-gü* > *čérkü* (> *čérkü+n*).

In this way, Blída jokingly named his buffoon *čérkün*, or "the inner [residence] official."

30. Ἤσλα.[197] This Hun was an experienced diplomat who served first Ruga (Hrṓgä) and later Attila. The first element of his name, or title, is *es* 'great, old' (see nos. 11, 13); the vowel *e* is rendered here by η; in the title *es qắm* the same word was written with ε.

+λα is the denominal suffix /lA/;[198] in Old Chuvash another suffix /lĂ/ < /liG/, having a similar meaning, was added to the same stem: *as-lă* < **äs+lig* 'old, great'.[199]

The Hunnic appellation *éslä* apparently meant "the great, old (gentleman)"; this was probably the way the Huns referred to their elder statesmen.

31. Κρέκαν.[200] As shown by Otto Maenchen-Helfen, the name of Attila's wife has a final /n/.[201] In 1916 Willy Bang-Kaup proposed a very

193 Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 145, l. 4 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 130.

194 Poppe, *MCS*, p. 176.

195 Ed. Moravcsik, in *Byz Tur*, 2: 355. See also *Zergo bula*, ibid., p. 356; cf. *Cerbulae*, with /*čer*/ as the first element; Veselin Beševliev, *Die Protobulgarischen Inschriften* ([East] Berlin, 1963), p. 169.

196 See Beševliev, *Die Protobulgarischen Inschriften*, pp. 169-70.

197 Ἤσλαν^acc^, see Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 121, ll. 7, 14; p. 128, l. 21; p. 130, l. 28; p. 149, l. 15; = *Byz Tur*, 2: 133.

198 On the denominal nominal suffix /lA/ see Brockelmann, *OTG*, p. 117 (§73); Räsänen, *Morphologie*, p. 104. The Greek letter α in Ησλα doubtlessly stands for /ä/, for which there was no letter in the alphabet.

199 Ašmarin, *Thesaurus*, 2: 106-107; *aslă* 'magnus, amplus, latus, spatiosus, maior natu, maximus, summus, illustris'. Egorov's etymology of *aslă* is certainly wrong: Egorov, *ÈSČJ*, p. 35.

200 Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 139, l. 22; p. 146, l. 7 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 173.

201 Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, p. 408.

attractive Turkic etymology for it. According to him, the lady's name was *Αρεκαν, i.e., **ariqan* < **ariġ qan* 'the pure princess'.[202] However, his pretty proposition can no longer be defended, since κρε- (or, for that matter, ηρε-)[203] cannot possibly stand for the Turkic *ariġ* 'pure'. In 1955 Pavel Poucha made another suggestion: he connected the Hunnic name with the Mongolian appellation for "wife," *gergei*, without giving any elaboration.[204] I came to the same conclusion independently, and my reasons (presented here in print for the first time) are as follows.

In Mongolian there exist two variants of the word in question: *SH gergai*[205] and WMo *gergen*.[206] Regarding the form with the final +*n* Nicholas Poppe writes: "In Written Mongolian the form *gergen* 'wife' from *gergei* id. is still used. The form *gergen* was originally a plural, but it has become a singular semantically, in the same manner as Khalkha *exxənər* 'woman' morphologically is a plural form of *exxə* 'mother'."[207]

The Hunnic form also has a final /n/: κρέκαν = krékäṉ like WMo gergeṉ.

The Turkic word for "wife," already existing in the Karakhanid language, was *eblig*, that is, "possessing a house" = "living at home."[208] *Eb* is the word for "house," whereas /lig/ is the suffix of the possessor.

The Mongolian word for house, which is the root *ger*, is augmented by the "class-suffix" /GA/, to which at an early time was added either the singulative suffix /i/ or the collective suffix /n/, in the sense described in my "Stammesnamen."[209] The connection between the semantic fields "house," "family," and "wife" can readily be illustrated in the Yakut language:

The word *kärgän* (the root *kär* is comparable to the Mongolian *ger*; +*gän* is also comparable to the Mongolian suffixes /GA/+/n/) means "family; house; all persons living in one house; member of a family; member of household."[210] Accordingly, *kärgännä-* (= *kärgän* +/LĀ/)

[202] W. Bang, "Uber die türkischen Namen einiger Grosskatzen," *Keleti Szemle* 17 (1917): 112, fn. 2.
[203] See *Byz Tur*, 2: 173.
[204] P. Poucha, *CAJ* 1 (1955): 291.
[205] *SH*, ed. Haenisch, §§ 1, 3, 94.
[206] Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 379.
[207] Poppe, *MCS*, p. 176.
[208] Clauson, *EDT*, p. 10. In some Turkic languages the word for house means "wife": Kazakh, Oirot (Altai), Baraba *ü* 'wife'; Teleut *üy* 'wife'; the data are given by Räsänen, *EWT*, p. 34, and Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ*, 1: 514.
[209] Cf. my "Stammesnamen" (see fn. 120), pp. 65-75.
[210] Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 1047.

has the meaning "to marry," and *kärgännäx* (*kärgän* + /LĀG/) that of "married."[211]

The Hunno-Bulgarian vocalic metathesis mentioned above (no. 12) is responsible for the change of **ker* into *kre-*. The *k-* in the initial position of the suffix /GAN/ is the result of Hunno-Turkic (e.g., Chuvash, Old Turkic) devoicing after *r*, *l*, *n*. Apparently **kerkän* developed from the older **kergän*. It is impossible to say whether the older Hunnic also had *g-* in the initial position of the word (like Mongolian *ger+*).[212]

The "name" of this primary wife of Attila, as noted in our sources, was not a personal name at all, but rather the Hunnic appellative *krékän* meaning "wife," since she was the Hunnic ruler's consort or "wife par excellence."

32. 'Ονηγήσιος[213]/*Hunigasius*.[214] The most powerful of Attila's *logades*, or ministers, was Ονηγησι-/*Hunigasi-* (*-os*/*-us* are foreign suffixes), "who held power second only to Attila."

The Mongolian word *ünen* 'truth'[215] (today also the title of Mongolia's official newspaper, namesake and imitator of the Russian *Pravda*) must be regarded as a deverbal noun from the unattested root **üne-*, which was of Mongolo-Turkic origin. That conclusion is based on the fact that in Mongolian the suffixes added to this reconstructed root **üne-*, are either of Mongolian or of Turkic origin:

(a) Turkic /msi/:[216] *üne-msi-* 'to believe, or accept as true, trust';[217]
(b) Turkic /nči/:[218] *üne-nči* 'honest, faithful, truthful, loyal';[219]
(c) Mo /GAr/:[220] *üne-ker* 'truly, really, indeed; very much, extremely'.[221]

The deverbal suffix /mlA/ can be either of Turkic or Mongolian origin, since it consists of the deverbal noun /m/, and the very productive

211 Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 1048.
212 See no. 22.
213 Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 123, l. 14; p. 127, ll. 11, 15, 18 etc. = *Byz Tur*, 2: 218.
214 "De S. Lupo episcopo confessore" (Acta antiqua), *Acta Sanctorum*, ed. Johannes Bollandus et al., *Julii*, Tomus VII (Venice, 1769), p. 70a, l. 17; cf. "S. Lupi Trecensis episcopi," *Surius, Historiae seu vitae sanctorum*, ed. Laurentius Gastaldi, vol. VII: *Julius* (Turin, 1877), p. 556, l. 25. On the identity of 'Ονηγήσιος and Hunigasio[abl], see Thompson, *A History of Attila and the Huns* (Oxford, 1948), p. 223; Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns*, p. 389; and Kemp Malone, *Studies in Heroic Legend* (Copenhagen, 1959), p. 106.
215 Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 1009.
216 von Gabain, *ATG*, p. 81 (§157).
217 Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 1008.
218 von Gabain, *ATG*, pp. 73-74, §125; Brockelmann, *OTG*, pp. 130-32.
219 Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 1009.
220 Szabó, *Szóképzés*, p. 49 (§127).
221 Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 1008.

denominal verbal suffix /lA/. But the form with the root *üne-* occurs only in Mongolian: *ünemle-* 'to certify, testify, attest'.[222]

According to Kāšġarī (ca. 1077) there was a Turkic Oghuz deverbal noun in /Āsi/, which corresponded to the Karakhanid suffix /Gu/, e.g., *bar-āsi yer* = *bar-ġu yer* 'a place of going'.[223]

Judging by the available historical data, the forms /Āsi/ ~ /Ās/ and /GĀs/ must originally have been two variants of the suffix of *nomen futuri (necessitatis)*, e.g., Kāšġarī *bič-ġās* 'a contract, or covenant'.[224]

In Hunnic the word apparently had a final *-i*, like the Oghuz form /Ās+i/, i.e., its form was */GĀsi/. The name or epithet of the Hunnic leader was, therefore, **üne-gāsi*, meaning "honest, faithful, truthful, loyal."

33. Σκόττας.[225] According to Priscus, this person was a prominent noble of Hunnic origin and brother of 'Ονηγήσιος. In our source he is depicted as a hotspur and a blusterer.

One of the typical features of the Hunno-Bulgarian linguistic group is a cluster in the word initial position. Such clusters developed—as mentioned above—due to vocalic metathesis, e.g., *blidä* < **bildä* (see no. 12), *krėkän* < **kerkän.* (see no. 31). In the same way *skö-* in σκοττα-*sköttä-* developed from the original **sökit-tä.*

The etymon *sök-* means "to tear apart, pull down, break through (an obstacle)"; *sök-it-* is formally the causative, attested as *hapax* in Old Turkic;[226] *sök-it-* > **sokət-*; the vocalic metathesis in the stem resulted in *sköt-*.

The root *sök-* had special importance in Turkic military parlance. According to Kāšġarī (1074), *sökmān* (/mĀn/ is a deverbal nominal suffix) was "a military title, meaning 'he who breaks the battle line (Arab *kāsir ṣaff al-ḥarb*)'."[227]

In **sökəttä* (> *sköttä*) there is the deverbal suffix /DA/, which was also recognized in the name *blida* (< **bil-dä*) (see no. 12).

One can assume that *sköttä* (< **sökəttä* = **sök-it-*), apparently having the same meaning as *verbum simplex*, was used, like *sökmān*, as a title or nickname meaning "hotspur."

[222] Lessing, *Dictionary*, p. 1008.
[223] Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 75, 86.
[224] Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 344. On the suffix /äsi/, see Pritsak, "Die Herkunft des tschuwaschischen Futurums," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 56 (1960): 150-51.
[225] Priscus, ed. de Boor, *EL*, p. 125, ll. 25, 27; p. 127, ll. 11, 26, 34 = *Byz Tur*, 2: 279.
[226] Clauson, *EDT*, pp. 819, 820.
[227] Kāšġarī/Dankoff, 1: 334.

C. *Linguistic and Philological Scrutiny*

I. Orthography

α/a	= *a*: αδαμ, ατα-, αττιλα/attila; +βαρσ-, βασιχ, balamur, δονατ, χαρα+,
α	= *ā*: καμ,
α/a	= *A*: αδαμ, αττιλα/attila, βληδα/bleda, ησλα, ellac, ἡρναχ/hernac, κρεκαν, ουπταρ/octar, ῥουγα, σκοττα,
β-/b-	= *b*: balamur, +βαρσ-, βασιχ, βληδα/bleda, βεριχ,
γ/g	= *g*: ῥουγα, δεγγιζιχ, ονηγησι/hunigasi,
γι-	= *g*-: γιεσμ-,
γγ	= *ng* (*ŋ*): δεγγιζιχ, ελμιγγειρ,
δ/d	= *d*: δονατ-, δεγγιζιχ/dentzic; αδαμ, εδεκων; βληδα/bleda, ουλδην/uldin, vltzindur,
δι, δ/dz, d	= *ǯ*: μουνδιο-, μουνδιουχ/mundzuc-, μουνδο/mundo-,
ε/e	= *e*: εδεκων, εσκαμ, ελμιγγειρ, ελμινζουρ/emnetzur; βεριχ, δεγγιζιχ/denzic, γιεσμ, κρεκαν,
e-	= *ē*: ellac,
ε	= *A*: εδεκων,
ε/e	= *I*: ζερκων, emnetzur,
ει	= *I*: ελμιγγειρ,
ζ/tz, [+]z	= *č*: ζερκων; δεγγιζιχ/dintzic, ελμινζουρ/emnetzur, vltzindur,
ἡ[< ἥ]/he	= *hē*: ἡρναχ/hernac
η/i	= *e*: ησλα; ονηγησι/hunigasi
η, ι/e	= *i*: βληδα, βλιδα-/bleda,
η/i	= *I*: ουλδην/uldin,
η/a	= *Ā*: ονηγησι/hunigasi,
η	= *y*: ωηβαρσ-,
ι/i	= *e*: δινζιχ/dintzic, δινζιριχ-,
ι/i	= *i*: αττιλα/attila, ελμιγγειρ, ελμινζουρ,
ι/i	= *I*: βασιχ, βεριχ, κουρσιχ, δεγγιζιχ/dintzic, vltzindur; ονηγησι/hunigasi,
κ/c	= *k*: κρεκαν, κουρσιχ; σκοττα, octar; εδεκων, ζερκων; hernac,
	= *q*: εσ+καμ,
c	= *g*: ellac,

λ/l	= *l*: ellac, ελμιγγειρ, ελμινζουρ, ονλδην/huldin, vltzindur, balamur, βληδα/bleda; αττιλα/attila, ησλα,
μ/m	= *m*: μουνδιουχ, μουνδιο, μουνδο/mundo; emnetzur, ελμιγγειρ, ελμινζουρ, balamur; αδαμ, αττακαμ, εσκαμ, γιεσμ,
ν/n	= *n*: δονατ, ονηγησι/hunigasi, dintzic, emnetzur, μουνδιουχ, μουνδο-/mundo, vltzindur, ελμινζουρ; ηρναχ/hernac; εδεκων, ζερκων, κρεκαν, ουλδην/huldin, uldin, χαρατων,
ο	= *o*: δονατ-,
ο/o	= *ö*: octar; σκοττα,
ο-/hu-	= *ü*-: ονηγησι/hunigasi,
-ο/-o	= -*U*: μουνδο-/mundo,
ου/u	= *u*: μουνδιουχ, μουνδο/mundo,
ου-/hu-, v-	= *ö*-: ουλδην/huldin, uldin, vltzindur, ουπταρ,
ου/o	= *ō̈*: ρουγα/roas, ουπταρ/octar,
ου	= *ü*: κουρσιχ,
ου/u	= *U*: ελμινζουρ/emnetzur, vltzindur,
῾[<῾] ῥ-/ηρ-/her-	= *hr*-: ῥουγα, ἡρναχ [< ἡρναχ]/hernac,
ρ/r	= *r*: βεριχ, ζερκων, κρεκαν, κουρσιχ, χαρατων, ἡρναχ/hernac; ωηβαρσ-; balamur, ουπταρ/octar, emnetzur, ελμινζουρ, ελμιγγειρ, vltzindur,
σ/s	= *s*: σκοττα; εσκαμ, ησλα; βασιχ, κουρσιχ, ονηγησι/hunigasi; γιεσμ; ωηβαρσ,
τ/t	= *t*: χαρα+των; ατ+τιλα/attila, σκοττα, αττακαμ, ουπταρ/octar; δονατ-,
χ-	= *q*-: χαρατων,
-χ/-c	= -*q*: μουνδιουχ/mundzuc,
-χ/-c	= -*k*: βεριχ, ἡρναχ/hernac,
-χ	= -*ġ*: βασιχ,
-χ/-c	= -*g*: δεγγιζιχ/dintzic, κουρσιχ,
ω	= *ō*: ωηβαρσ-; χαρα+των,
ω	= *U*: εδεκων, ζερκων.

II. Phonology

1. *Consonantism in General*

Seventeen consonantic phonemes are attested:

	kq	t	č	s
b	gġ	d	ǯ	
m	ŋ	n		
l	r	y		
h				

There was, at the very least, a clear distinction between the front and back *k* and *q*, and the latter (*q*) was pronounced, in absolute initial and final positions, like a spirant *x*; see the Greek notations: χ̱αράτων [xarátōn] and μουνδίουχ̱- [munǯúx] for *qarátōn* and *munǯúq*, and εσκ̱άμ *esqā́m*. Since *qām* was not in absolute initial position, its *q*- was not spirantized.

A tendency towards spirantization can also be observed with the final -*ġ* and possibly -*k* and -*g*: βέριχ̱-/bériḵ/and βασίχ̱ /basíġ/ and κουρσίχ̱ /kürsíg̱/.

One can regard the presence of the initial *h*- as a specific feature of Hunnic consonantism: ẖernac/ẖērnäk/, ῥ̱οῦγα /ẖrṓgä/.

The compound *attíla* (< **es* + *tíla*), with initial *a* from original **e* but with middle front *i*, indicates that there was a consonantic palatal harmony in Hunnic, comparable to that in Old Turkic. Therefore I interpret *tíla* as having the back consonantic phonemes *t* and *l*. Unfortunately, the limited material does not support any far-reaching conclusions.

As to their morphonemic occurrences, the Hunnic consonantic phonemes can be grouped according to their positions within the root (stem) and the suffixes. Here, it must be stressed, our data is very incomplete, but even so it can help us understand the operational structures:

Stems (first syllable)					*Suffixes*			
				Initial position				
simple consonants								
	kq	t	č	s			č	s
b	gġ	d				G	D	
m					m			
					l			
h								

clusters

bl	hr	kr	sk

Final position

simple consonants

	kq	t	s			k	
		d				gġ	
m	ŋ	n			m		n
l	r	y				r	

clusters

rs	sm(?)

2. *Consonantic medial clusters* (often at the morphonological juncture)

-kt- : ö́*kt*är;
-tt- : a*tt*íla (< **ets*ila < *e*s*+t^1il^{1}a); skö*tt*ä
-mn- : *emne*čür (< *-*lm*-);
-ng-(*ŋ*) : elmi*ng*ir (< elmi*n*+*g*ir);
-nd- : ölči*nd*ür (< ölči*n*+*d*ür);
-nč- : ölti*nč*ür (< ölti*n*+*č*ür), elmi*nč*ǘr (= elmi*n*+*č*ür);
-nǯ- : mú*nǯ*u (< *mu*n*+*ǯ*u) > mu*nǯ*úq;
-lč- : ö*lč*indür (< *ö*l*-*č*in < *ö*l*-*ď*in);
-ld- : ö́*lď*in (< ö*l*-*ď*in);
-lm- : e*lm*in, e*lm*inčǘr etc.;
-ll- : e*ll*äg (< e*l*+*l*äg);
-rk- : čé*rk*ün (< *iči*r*-*g*ün); cf. *krékän* < *ke*r*+*g*ä+n (possibly < *ge*r*+*g*än)
-rs- : kü*rś*ig (< kü*r*+*s*ig < *kü*rə*+*s*ig < **kürä*+*sig*);
-rn- : he*rn*ä́k (< *he*r*+ä*n*+äk);
-sl- : é*sl*ä.

3. *Vocalism*

(a) First syllable

Seven vocalic phonemes are certainly attested: three back (*a*, *o*, *u*), three front (*e*, *ö*, *ü*), and the neutral (although phonetically front) *i*. The same system of vocalism is attested in Old Turkic. I may add that the phonemically neutral /i/ is also typical for Old Chuvash and Mongolian.

The quantity was phonemic, since of the total of seven vowels, four long vowels are reconstructable from the limited data available to us.[228]

The vocalic system can be presented graphically as follows:

Simple Vowels				Long Vowels		
i			ü[229]	u		
	e	ö			ē	ȫ ō
	a				ā	

(b) Second or Succeeding Syllable

In the suffixes appear the two archphonemes A (its realization was *a* or *ä*), U (=*u* or *ü*) and the neutral phoneme *i*, which in closed syllables has a tendency to become a *schwa* (*ə*) or to disappear (but under stress develops to *é*):

I (=i/é/ə)		U
	A, Ā	

The attested realization of the suffixed vocalism is as follows:

/i/ : +*ə*-, +*ér*- (< *+*i-r*-); +*číG*, +*síG*, -*Din* (> -*tin*), +*Gir*,
/A/ : +*A̧*, +*ÁK*, +*An*; -*DA*, -*GA*, +*GAn*, +*lA*, +*lA*-, +*lAG*,
/Ā/ : -*GǞsi*,
/U/ : +*čÚr*, +*DUr*, -*GUn*, +*mUr*.

Here, as in Old Turkic, the vocalic phonemes appear singly, rather than in clusters.

There is a clear palatal harmony: *a*, *o*, *u*; *q*, *ġ* versus *e*, *ö*, *ü*; *k*, *g*, e.g., *munǯúq* and *hērnǟk*.

But no labial harmony or labial attraction can be detected, e.g., *donát*, *ȫ́gä*, *kürsíg*.

[228] Instead of assuming that writers in the first half of the fifth century had already disregarded the vocalic quantity, I believe that it was not accidental that Olympiodorus in A.D. 425 writes Χαρα-τω̣ν by means of the omega (των) — this for a word which had a vocalic length (*tōn*). The same principle applies to the very exact notations of Priscus, who writes Ὦ̣η-βαρσ- (= *ōy*), Ἠρναχ (= *hēr*-), Ῥοῦα (= *hr-ȫ*[g]*ä*), etc.

[229] The only pair of Hunnic phonemes that the Greek and Latin autors had difficulty distinguishing clearly and rendering systematically were the labial front vowels *ö* and *ü*:

ö	ü
Greek o/Latin o̱: o̱ctar, σκο̱ττα;	
Greek ου-: ο̱ὐ̱πταρ;	Greek ου: κο̱υ̱ρσιχ;
Greek ου-/Latin ẖu̱- ~ u̱- ~ y̱-: ο̱υ̱λδην/ẖu̱ldin, u̱ldin, y̱ltzin-	Greek o-/Latin ẖu̱-: ο̱νηγησι/ẖu̱nigasi.
Greek ου-/Latin o̱: ῥο̱υ̱γα/ro̱as.	

On the other hand, the labiality of the suffix archphoneme is kept, regardless of the non-round stem, e.g., b*a*lam*u*r, *e*lm*i*nč*ű*r, *ö*lt*i*nč*ü*r, č*é*rk*ü*n.

III. Phonemic Changes

1. *Vocalism*

Vocalic metathesis
**bil*dä > *blí*dä;
**sök*ittä > **sökəttä* > *skő*ttä
**kerk*än > *kré*kän;

Mittelsilbenschwund
**kürä*+sig > *kür*sig; **sökit*dä > *skő*ttä;
*her+*än*+*äk* > her*nák*;

Vocalic reduction in the word-initial position
**ič*irgün > *čér*kün;

Vocalic changes: transitions into stressed and non-stressed position
-i- > *-é-*: **ičir*gün > *čér*kün;
-i- > *-ə-*: *elm*ín*+ > *é*mn*ə*[n]+;

Assimilation
e > *a*: *e*s+t¹il¹a > *a*ttíla.

2. *Consonantism*

Reduction of sonors being the first element of a cluster
nč > *č*: *emne*nč*ür > emne*č*ür;
rč > *č*: deŋ*irč*ig > deŋ*ič*ig;
rg > *k*: *edä*rg*ün > ed*ä́k*ün;
rss > *s*: *ba*rss*iġ > ba*s*íġ.

3. *Consonantic assimilations*

Metathesis
**st* > **ts* > *tt*: *e*st*ila > *e*ts*íla > a*tt*íla;
**ml* > *lm*: *em*l*ín > e*lm*in;
[**ml* >] *lm* > *mn*: *el*m*in > e*mn*ə[n];

Devoicing
**rg* > *rk*: *ke*rg*än > *ke*rk*än > kr*é*kän; *iči*rg*ün > čé*rk*ün;

**ld* > *lt*: ȍl*d́*in > öl*t*in;
**td* > *tt*: *söki*td*ä > skő*tt*ä;

Sporadic palatalization
lt (< *ld*) > *lč*: öl*t*in- (< öl*d́*in) > öl*č*in-.

IV. Materials to a Hunnic Grammar

1. *Stems*

Nouns
One-syllable
**ad*
bars
ēl
es
ges
hēr
**ker* (< **ger*?)
qām
ōy
**t¹il¹*
tōn

Two-syllable
ata
bala
bérik
**deŋir*
donát
elmín (< **emlin* > **emnən*)
éslä
krékän (< **kérkän*)
**kürä*
qará
múnǯu
munǯúq

Composite nouns
ata qā́m
qará tōn

es qā́m
ṓy bárs
**es t¹íl¹a*

Verbs

One-syllable
bli- (< **bil-*)
öl-
ȫ-
sköt- (< **sökit-*)

Two-syllable
adá-
**edā́r-*
ēllä-
**gési-* (> **gésə-*)
**ič+i-r-* (> *čér-*)
ȫ́ktä-
üne-

2. *Suffixes*

Denominal nominal
/A/: attíl*a*, *kür*ä*
/An/+/AK/ > /nAK/: hēr*nā́k*
/čiG/: deŋi[r]*čig*
/čUr/: elmin*čǖr* (> emnə*čür*), öltin*čür*
/DUr/: ölčin*dür*
/GAn/: kré*kän*
/Gir/: elmín*gir*
/K/: munǯu*q*
/lA/: és*lä*
/lAG/: ēl*läg*
/mUr/: bala*mur*
/siG/: ba[rs]*síg*, kür*síg*

Denominal nominal affixes
/n/: krékä*n*, ṓldi*n*, čérkü*n*
/r/: balamu*r*

Deverbal nominal
/DA/: blí*dä*, skṓt*tä*

/Din/ > *-tin-* > *-čin-*: ö́l*din*, öl*tin*čür, öl*čin*dür
/G/: ellä*g*
/GA/: *ȫ́gä*
/GĀsi/: üne*gā́si*
/GUn/: čér*kün*, edā́*kün*
/m/: gés*m*, adá*m*
/r/: ö́ktä*r*

Denominal verbal
/lA/: el*läg*
*/i/ > /ə/: gésəm, čérkün (< *ič+*i*-r-)

Deverbal verbal
/Ir/: č*ér*kün
/It/: *sköt-* (< **sök-ət* < **sök-it*)

3. *Stress*

My premise here is that the Middle Greek accentuation of foreign names can be treated seriously. Based on this hypothesis, one arrives at the following conclusions:

(a) Two-syllable words that were not clear etymologically to the speakers had the stress on the ultima: *adám, donát, qará, munǯúq* (but, interestingly enough, *múnǯu* ~ *munǯú*).

(b) Two-syllable words that were transparent, rightly or not, to the speaker had the stress on the penultima (stem): *ȫ́gä* (< *ȫ-*), *ö́ldin* (< *öl-*), *bérik, ö́ktär, gésəm* (or *gesm*?), *múnǯu* (< Chinese loanword).

(c) Suffixes were divided into two groups: (1) stressed and (2) non-stressed.

(d) Stressed suffixes: (1) denominal nominal: /ÁK/: *hernā́k*; /číG/: *deŋirčig*; /síG/: *basíg, kürsíg*; /čUr̦/: *elminčű́r*; (2) denominal verbal: /Á/: *adám*; (3) deverbal nominal: /GĀ́si/: *ünegā́si*;.

(e) Non-stressed suffixes: (1) denominal nominal: /lA/: *ésla*, /Gir/: *elmíngir*; /GAn/: *krékän*; (2) deverbal nominal: /DA/: *blídä, skö́ttä*; /Din/: *ö́ldin*; /GUn/: *čérkü*n, *edékün.*

(f) Composite nouns had the stress placed either on each component, e.g., *ō̃y bárs*, or on their second component; if the latter had two syllables, stress was placed on the penultima: *es qā́m, ata qā́m; hər-ȫ́gä, attíla.*

The only exception to this rule was *qará tōn*, which had the stress on the ultima of the first component. Apparently *qará tōn* was not yet considered to be a true composite noun.

D. *Concluding Remarks*

Our detailed analysis of the Hunnic onomastic material, together with examination of it from the point of view of Altaistic linguistics, has yielded very positive results indeed. It has proved that it is possible to determine the character of the Hunnic language.[230] It was not a Turkic language, but one between Turkic and Mongolian, probably closer to the former than the latter. The language had strong ties to Old Bulgarian and to modern Chuvash, but also had some important connections, especially lexical and morphological, to Ottoman and Yakut.

Hunnic vocalism, consisting of seven vowels with quantitative opposition (long: short) but with the singular high-front vowel *i*, is comparable to Old Turkic and Old Mongolian vocalism. However, it seems not to have included diphthongs.

Hunnic had a palatal harmony (probably syllabic), but neither labial harmony nor labial attraction.

As to consonantism, its initial position in Hunnic was in agreement with Old (and Middle) Mongolian rather than with Old Turkic: *h*-, as well as the voiced stops *d*- and *g*-, were allowed to occur. But like Proto-Bulgarian, Hunnic possessed clusters in the initial position. The medial -*d*- in the stem is of great significance, since it is different from the Proto-Bulgarian and Chuvash.

Also, Hunnic shared rhotacism with Mongolian, Old Bulgarian, and Chuvash.

It is highly probable, however, that Hunnic had a palatal correlation of its consonantism, of the Old Turkic type.

* * *

When I decided to experiment with the thirty-three Hunnic names in an effort to determine their linguistic relationship, I did not have any preconceptions about what the results would be, that is, whether the

[230] The last contribution to deal with the language of the Huns was Gerhard Doerfer's article, "Zur Sprache der Hunnen," published in *CAJ* 17, no. 1 (1973): 1-50. Alas, it is a very disappointing and unproductive study. Contrary to the addage he himself there notes, "zuviel Skepsis ist unkritisch" (p. 32), the author overindulges his scepticism, and, naturally enough, arrives at a completely negative conclusion. Instead of examining the Hunnic onomastic material in a detailed structural analysis, based on knowledge of Old Bulgarian, Chuvash, Yakut, Old Turkic, and Old Ottoman material, Professor Doerfer wasted the greater part of his study on magisterial theorizing and on pun-etymologies.

reconstructed language would prove to be Altaic, Iranian, Ugric, or anything else. I simply wanted to ascertain definitely whether or not the existing onomastic material was adequate for such a quest, i.e., whether it would show the required structural uniformity. I did not treat each onomastic item in isolation, thereby creating "phonemic laws" *ad hoc*, but rather constantly checked to see whether or not any clear and convincing structural pattern of morphonemics for the entire body of data would emerge. Also, I carefully avoided changing a single letter in my sources so as to benefit my "ingenious" reconstructions and constructs.

The results have been more than satisfying. Not only did a clear structural pattern in the Hunnic language emerge, but also it was possible to reconstruct the language's morphonemic system almost in its entirety, and even to establish its accentuation patterns.

The deciphering of meanings of the reconstructed words (which were not provided with translations) and forms (derivations) found corroboration in the realia of Hunnic history and culture. This was especially true with reference to the "names," or, better still, the designations of offices/professions, epithets, and nicknames of the Hunnic leaders from a specific time, A.D. 448-449.

I hope that the experiment described and reproduced here will be judged successful by scholarship and that the mystery of the character of the Hunnic language will be regarded as solved.

Harvard University

INDICES

1. Index verborum*

Non-Hunnic names

2. Index of Suffixes

* The numbers correspond to the paragraphs in section B, *The Analysis of the Onomastic Material*; + denotes denominal suffixes, and - denotes deverbal suffixes.

APPENDIX: *The Genealogy of Attila's Clan*

Stage I

1. Balamur, *fl.* 375

Stage II

2. Βάσιχ, *fl.* ca. 395

3. Κουρσίχ, *fl.* ca. 395

4. Οὔλδην/Uldin, *fl.* ca. 395-410

5. Δονάτ (successor of Οὔλδην), ca. 410-412

6. Χαράτων (successor of Δονάτ), ca. 412-420

Stage III

N. n.

7. Μουνδίουχ/Mundzuc	8. Octar/Οὔπταρ	9. Ῥούγα/Roa	10. Ὠηβάρς	11. Ἔσκαμ	N. n.	N. n.
ca. 420-430	d. 430	ca. 430-433	d. 449	*fl.* 448-449		

12. Βλήδα/Bleda	13. Ἀττίλα ~	daughter	14. Ἀτακάμ	15. Μάμας	16. Laudaricus
433-444	444-453	N. n.	d. 433	d. 433	d. 451

~ 31. Κρέκαν

17. Ellac	18. Δεγγιζίχ/Dentzic	19. Ἠρνάχ/Hernac	20. Emnetzur	21. Vltzindur
31	31	31		
d. 455	d. 469	d. after 466	d. after 469	d. after 469

Stage IV 22. Γιέσμ, *fl.* 5th-6th ct.

23. Μοῦνδο/Mundo, d. 536

24. Ἐλμίγγειρος, *fl.* 556 25. Ἐλμινζούρ, *fl.* 556

ABBREVIATIONS

(a) *Publications*

Ašmarin, *Thesaurus* = Nikolaj Ivanovič Ašmarin, *Thesaurus Linguae Tschuvaschorum*, 17 vols. (Kazan and Čeboksary, 1928-1950).
Bašk = K. Z. Axmerov et al., eds., *Baškirsko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1958).
Brockelman, *OTG* = Carl Brockelmann, *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Litteratursprachen Mittelasiens* (Leiden, 1954).
Byz Tur = Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Berlin, 1958).
CAJ = *Central Asiatic Journal*.
CC = *Codex Cumanicus, in Faksimile herausgegeben* ... von Kaare Grønbech (Copenhagen, 1936); K. Grønbech, *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus* (Copenhagen, 1942).
Cincius, *Sravn Slov Tung* = Vera Ivanovna Cincius, *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov*, 2 vols. (Leningrad, 1975-1977).
Clauson, *EDT* = Gerard Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish* (Oxford, 1972).
Derleme sözlügü = *Türkiye'de Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü*, ed. Türk Dil Kurumu, 2nd ser. (Ankara, 1963-).
Doerfer, *TMEN* = Gerhard Doerfer, *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, 4 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1963-1975).
Egorov, *ÈSČJ* = Vasilij Georgievič Egorov, *Ètimologičeskij slovar' čuvasskogo jazyka* (Čeboksary, 1964).
EL, ed. de Boor = Carolus de Boor, ed., *Excerpta de legationibus*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1903-1906).
von Gabain, *ATG* = Annemarie von Gabain, *Alttürkische Grammatik*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1950).
Getica, ed. Skržinskaja = Elena Česlavovna Skržinskaja, *Jordan, O proisxoždenii i dejanijax getov: Getica* (Moscow, 1960).
GSR = Bernhard Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa* (Stockholm, 1957).
Haenisch, *Wörterbuch* = Erich Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi). Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen* (Leipzig, 1939).
HGM, ed. Dindorf = Ludwig Dindorf, *Historici graeci minores*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1870-1871).
Kāšġarī/Dankoff = Robert Dankoff, ed. and trans., *Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī, Compendium of the Turkish Dialects*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).
Kāšġ(arī) facs. = *Divanü lûgat-it-türk tıpkıbasımı "faksimile,"* ed. Besim Atalay (Ankara, 1941).
Kirg = Konstantin K. Judaxin, *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1965).
KKlp = Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov, ed., *Karakalpaksko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1958).
Kzk = G. Musabaev, *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar'* (Alma-Ata, 1954).
Lessing, *Dictionary* = Ferdinand D. Lessing, ed., *Mongolian-English Dictionary* (Berkeley, 1960).
MA, ed. Poppe = Nikolaj Nikolaevič Poppe, *Mongol'skij slovar' Mukaddimat al-adab*, 3 pts. (Moscow and Leningrad, 1938-1939).

Maenchen-Helfen, *Huns* = Otto J. Maenchen-Helfen, *The World of the Huns* (Berkeley, 1973).

MGH AA = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores Antiquissimi*, 15 vols. (Hanover and Berlin, 1877-1919).

Migne, *PG* = J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeco-latina*, 161 vols. (Paris, 1857-1866).

Nadeljaev, *DTS* = V. M. Nadeljaev et al., eds., *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'* (Leningrad, 1969).

New Redhouse = *New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*, ed. by Redhouse Press (Istanbul, 1968).

Nog = N. A. Baskakov, ed., *Nogajsko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1963).

NUig = Emir Nadžipovič Nadžip, *Ujgursko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1968).

Piekarski = Edward Piekarski (Èduard Karlovič Pekarskij), *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka*, 3 vols. (reprinted [Budapest], 1958).

Poppe, *MCS* = Nicholas Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies* (Helsinki, 1955).

Poppe, *Vgl Gr Alt* = Nikolaus Poppe, *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen*, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1960).

Pritsak, *Fürstenliste* = Omeljan Pritsak, *Die bulgarische Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren* (Wiesbaden, 1955).

Pritsak, *OR* = O. Pritsak, *The Origin of Rus'*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

Pritsak, *Studies* = O. Pritsak, *Studies in Medieval Eurasian History* (London, 1981).

QB = *Kutadgu Bilig I. Metin*, ed. Reşid Rahmeti Arat (Istanbul, 1947);
F = *Kutadgu Bilig tıpkıbasım II. Fergana nüshası* (Istanbul, 1943);
H = *id.*, *I. Viyana nüshası* (Istanbul, 1942).

Radloff, *Wb* = Wilhelm Radloff (Vasilij Vasil'evič Radlov), *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte* (reprinted The Hague, 1960).

Ramstedt, *Einführung* = Gustaf John Ramstedt, *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft*, 3 vols. (Helsinki, 1952-1966).

Ramstedt, *KWb* = G. J. Ramstedt, *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch* (Helsinki, 1935).

Räsänen, *EWT* = Martti Räsänen, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, 2 vols. (Helsinki, 1969, 1971).

Räsänen, *Lautgeschichte* = M. Räsänen, *Materialien zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen* (Helsinki, 1949).

Räsänen, *Morphologie* = M. Räsänen, *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen* (Helsinki, 1957).

Redhouse = Sir James W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople, 1890).

Schnetz = J. Schnetz, *Itineraria Romana*, vol. 2: *Ravennatis anonymi cosmographia et Guidionis geographica* (Leipzig, 1940).

Schönfeld, *Wörterbuch* = M. Schönfeld, *Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Personen- und Völkernamen* (Heidelberg, 1911).

Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ* = Èrvand Vladimirovič Sevortjan, *Ètimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov* (Moscow, 1974-).

SH = "Secret History of the Mongols," Erich Haenisch, *Monghol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan ch'ao pi-shi). I. Die geheime Geschichte der Mongolen aus der chinesischen Transkription...wiederhergestellt von...*, vol. 1: *Text*, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden, 1962).

Szabó, *Szóképzés* = Szabó Teréz Mária, *A Kalmük szóképzés* (Budapest, 1943).
Tarama Sözlüğü = *XIII yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklariyle Tarama Sözlüğü*, ed. by Türk Dil Kurumu, 2nd ser. (Ankara, 1963-).
Tat = *Tatarsko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1966).
Tkm = N. A. Baskakov et al., eds., *Turkmensko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1968).
Tuv = Aleksandr Adol'fovič Pal'mbax, *Tuvinsko-russkij slovar'* (Moscow, 1955).
Vasmer, *REW* = Max Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols. (Heidelberg, 1953-1958).

Note: The Old Turkic Inscriptions are quoted according to the established system: I = Kül Tigin, II = Bilgä Qaġan (both after the Finnish Atlas: *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon* [Helsinki, 1892]); To = Tonyuquq (after the edition of G. J. Ramstedt — Pentti Aalto, *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, vol. 60 [Helsinki, 1958]). The appropriate abbreviation is followed by a specific designation (e.g., N = North, S = South, etc.) and the line number.

(b) *Languages*

Arab = Arabic
Arch Chin = Archaic Chinese
Baš = Bashkir
Bulg = Proto-Bulgarian
Čuv = Chuvash
Čag = Chaghatai
DBulg = Danube Proto-Bulgarian
Hun = Hunnic
Kirg = (New) Kirgiz
Mo = Mongolian
MMo = Middle Mongolian
MTü = Middle Turkic
OT = Old Turkic
Özb = Özbek (Uzbek)
Tü = Turkic
VBulg = Volga Proto-Bulgarian
WMo = Written Mongolian

Nikolaj Leskov's Reminiscences of Kiev: Examples of His Memoir Style

CATHERINE D. BOWERS

Leskov's was a narrative talent. His first consideration as a writer was to tell a lively tale, *pobasënka*, without which, he writes, "the reader begins to nod and may fall asleep altogether."[1] He drew inspiration for his art from life. An astute observer of the curious and the exotic, Leskov found the world around him a rich source of fascinating and absorbing material for his tales. Speaking on the subject of literary style and method, the author admitted that he preferred concrete fact to invention in his creative process, citing the following reasons:

> Я выдумываю тяжело и трудно и потому всегда нуждался в живых людях, которые могли меня заинтересовать своим духовным содержанием. Они мною овладевали, и я старалася воплощать их в рассказах, в основу которых тоже весьма часто клал действительные события . . . Я только или списывал виденное и слышанное, или жи развивал характеры, взятые из действительности.[2]

In a letter to L. N. Tolstoj, Leskov wrote that he enjoyed writing about that "which was" (*o tom, čto bylo*) because it allowed him to move freely from episode to episode without regard to chronology or subject. Above all this form of writing, reminiscences, provided the author with the greatest possibility for the individualization of speech—Leskov's primary device for character development (569, XI).

This approach to the literary craft of storytelling—taking a real situation or an actual character as a starting point for his narrative—led the author to exuberant experimentation with genres outside the dominant genre of his time, the realistic novel. In the frequently quoted letter to F. I. Buslaev (1877), Leskov writes that the novel is artificial and unnatural, and that the memoir form

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, all the references to Leskov's stories are from the 1956 collection of his works, *N. S. Leskov, Sobranie sočinenij*, 11 vols. (Moscow, 1956). References to his works are made here by volume and page only. Leskov to Lebedincev (12 November 1882), 8:522–23. In the letter Leskov wrote: "Razumeetsja èto budet ne istorija, a pobasënki. . . a bez nix (kak Gogol' govoril) čitatel' načinajet spat' i možet sovsem usnut'. . . ."

[2] Cited from M. S. Gorjačkina, *Satira Leskova* (Moscow, 1963), p. 143.

(*memuarnaja forma*) is truer to life. The circular nature of the novel—the convention of arranging all material around one major center, and the rounding off of action at the end—is contrary to the natural flow of life, according to Leskov.[3] The hero in "Detskie gody," his highly autobiographical literary reminiscence, echoes the same perception of reality, "Man's life proceeds like an unfolding chart from a cliff. . . ."[4]

Among Leskov's most innovative genres is his own brand of memoir story, a core memoir embedded in a larger work as an illustration of a moral or social issue (thus Hugh McLean's term "illustrative memoir"). The Leskovian memoir story also includes the genre described by the Soviet critic I. P. Viduèckaja as *rasskaz-fel'eton*.[5] The story-feuilleton is a composition characterized by a fusion of fact and fiction. Here Leskov uses his personal reminiscences in a combined role of publicist and artist. The best examples of the story-feuilleton are the biting satires written in the last decade of the author's life, "Umeršee soslovie" (1888) or "Zagon" (1893).

Leskov's works encompassing his recollections of people, places, and events in his Kievan years are excellent examples of his memoir writing and style. The stories include: "Pečerskie antiki (Otrivki iz junošeskix vospominanij)," 1883; "Ščast'e v dvux ètažax (Kievskij variant živyx ljudej 'bumažnym ljudjam Nevy')," after 1880; "Vladyčnyj sud. Byl' (Iz nedavnyx vospominanij)," 1877; and "Figura: iz vospominanij o pravednikax," 1889.[6]

Leskov came to Kiev when he was eighteen years old, after his father's death in 1849, and he left the city to pursue his writing career in Petersburg in 1861. These were important formative years for the young Nikolaj Leskov, writes his biographer son, Andrej. "My father became a true and devoted son of Kiev," Andrej records in *Žizn' Nikolaja Leskova*, "and in later years its chronicler and historian."[7]

[3] Leskov to F. I. Buslaev (1 June 1877), 10:449–52.

[4] Leskov, "Detskie gody," 5:179. "Žizn' čeloveka idët kak razvyvajuščajasja so skalki xartija, i ja ee tak prosto i budu razvyvat' lentoj."

[5] Cited in I. P. Viduèckaja, "Žanr rasskaza v tvorčestve N. S. Leskova," *Filologičeskie nauki* (Moscow), 1961, no. 2, p. 80.

[6] Leskov, "Pečerskie antiki," 7:133–219; "Vladyčnyj sud," 6:88–145; "Figura," 7:463–86; "Ščast'e v dvux ètažax," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Iz istorii russkoj literatury i obščestvennoj mysli 1860–1890 gg.*, ed. V. R. Ščerbina et al., vol. 87 (Moscow, 1977), pp. 97–115.

[7] Andrej Leskov, *Žizn' Nikolaja Leskova po ego ličnym semejnym i nesemejnym zapisjam i pamjatjam* (Moscow, 1954), p. 90. Andrej writes that the years in Kiev were for his father: ". . . leta naibolee cennyx sil'nyx i vozdejstvujuščix na duxovnoe for-

It would be a mistake to consider Leskov a genuine chronicler of the Kievan years, for his imagination was always ready to step in where reality paled. As indicated above, his recollections belong to the forms of prose where fictional genres border on non-fictional genres. Leskov's Kiev in "Pečerskie antiki" is a fairy tale, the realm of a folk hero who repeatedly outwits the wicked governor, helps the poor, heals the sick with his magic potion, and possesses a horse, Sampson, of supernatural strength, unusual hair, and phenomenal tail which spread behind him like a cloud, and on which one could ride like on a lady's train (157, VII). And although these fantastic images exist only in the imagination of the Kievan people, it is precisely their fantasy that impart the color and the flavor of the real city. In the exposition to "Pečerskie antiki," Leskov indicated that his aim here was not to record history, but to recreate the *byt*, the inventiveness, vitality, and diversity of pre-reform Kiev (in the 1850s), and to capture the character of the unique individuals who lived there in the ancient Cossack spirit (*v starodavnom zaporožskom duxe*).

The character behind the legend is Kesar' Stepanovič Berlinskij, a real person, who, through his ingenious improvizations, assisted the inhabitants of the Pečersk district, a dilapidated but picturesque section of Kiev, to survive the tyrannical rule of Governor-General Dmitrij Gavrilovič Bibikov. Bibikov was governor of Kiev from 1837 to 1852, and his reign was noted for forced Russification of the entire southwestern region of Imperial Russia. His boorish manner and dictatorial ways were satirized in boisterous anecdotes which circulated freely in the city, some of which were recorded by Leskov.[8]

Berlinskij is only one in the gallery of eccentrics portrayed in "Pečerskie antiki." There is also the priest Evfimij Botvinovskij, a man of expensive tastes and a generous nature, but with only a small and very poor parish. There is Konstantin, nicknamed Lomonosov because of his broken nose, Botvinovskij's semi-literate and cunning deacon who supported the kindhearted but frivolous priest's wife and children. Above all there are the Old Believer (*starec*) Malafej, and his novice, Giezij, who came to Kiev to witness the restoration of the nation to the Old faith as prophesied by Malafej himself. According to the Old Believer, this

---

mirovanie vpečatlenij." He adds that his father became Kiev's "xronikerom i bytopisatelem, kakix malo najdetsja vo vsej našej literature" (98).

8 See Andrej Leskov, *Žizn' Nikolaja Leskova*, pp. 98–99.

moment was to take place during the opening of the new bridge over the Dnieper River by the tsar.

Leskov, who knew Giezij and was present during the dedication of the *cepnyj* bridge, used his recollection of the event as a basis for an historic anecdote to be published in the monthly journal *Kievskaja starina.* The work quickly grew into a string of loosely connected sketches of eccentric individuals who populated the Kiev of Leskov's youth. The composition, held together by the author-narrator's voice, is written in vibrant and expressive language, and sparkling good humor, *pel'-mel' s goroškom*, by the author's own admission.[9] Leskov the chronicler recorded the personalities and events in Kiev of the 1850s, while Leskov the storyteller transformed even the darker side of life in that period into "an old happy fairy tale."

A story attributed to Leskov which in theme and style clearly belongs to the same period as "Pečerskie antiki" was recently discovered in the archives of *Kievskaja starina* by Boris Vasil'evič Varneke. Professor Varneke, a Soviet literary historian who devoted part of his professional life to the collection of lost and forgotten works by Leskov, found the short story in 1928. However, "Ščast'e v dvux ètažax," the story's title, appeared in print for the first time only in 1977, in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo.*[10]

"Ščast'e" is a framed story in which Leskov draws a vivid portrait of another Kievan eccentric, Fortunat Karpyč Dubov. According to Varneke, the editor of *Kievskaja starina*, Feofan G. Lebedincev, recognized in the portrait (in spite of the fictional name of Dubov) a leading financier of Kiev, and offered to squelch the story if the influential financier forgave him (Lebedincev) an outstanding debt.[11] Judging from the provocative nature of the story, the financier was happy to settle on the offer.

Leskov's Dubov is a successful Ukrainian businessman. He was raised by his uncle, a priest, in a Kievan seminary, and later learned the lumber business while teaching Greek and Latin in Volhynia. In time he built his own lumber business along the mighty Dnieper. Dubov had a capable and faithful bailiff, Juxim Karpo, who had an equally faithful wife, Evfrosin'ja Naumova. Dubov never married,

[9] See the Notes to "Pečerskie antiki," 7:523.

[10] N. S. Leskov, "Ščast'e v dvux ètažax," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 87:97–115.

[11] Varneke writes that Lebedincev gave Leskov's manuscript to the unnamed businessman in exchange for an unpaid debt. He told the author, however, that the censors did not pass his story, and "generously" forgave the advance he had already paid Leskov. Leskov, "Ščast'e v dvux ètažax," p. 93.

but kept a mistress, or *pokoivka* (from the Ukrainian *pokij*, "room"). When his young mistress died unexpectedly, Dubov convinced Evfrosin'ja Naumovna to take her place for a sum of money. Without much soul searching, Juxim Karpo accepted his wife's new duties as Dubov's *pokoivka*, and life continued in harmony and prosperity.

The core story of "Ščast'e" shares motifs with "Pečerskie antiki"—Governor-General Bibikov and his successor Prince Vasilčikov and his wife Princess Ščerbatova, a robust picture of Ukrainian *byt*, attention to Ukrainian expressions and humor, and detailed description of the city as well as the region along the Dnieper which recalls his earlier travelogue "Iz odnogo dorožnogo dnevnika."[12] However, where there was little tendentious material in "Pečerskie antiki," in "Ščast'e" Leskov engages Dostoevskij in a polemic on his treatment of reality in *Podrostok*. He does this in the outerframe which, suggests Andrej Leskov, his father added to an independent story about a Kievan acquaintance.[13] The intended moral behind the core memoir is to show that flesh and blood people, *ljudi žizni* (as expressed in the subtitle), look for simple solutions and a painless existence. Reality, argues the fictional narrator in the conclusion, is paler, more commonplace than the love triangle in *Podrostok*, where the characters are ruled by the romantic-dramatic whims of the author and not by life itself, in other words, where they exist as *bumažnye ljudi*, or fictional people.[14]

"Vladyčnyj sud" follows the familiar pattern of Leskov's narratives. It contains a core memoir, the author's favorite literary device, that is, a statement of the central idea in a short introductory chapter (in a framework construction such as "Ščast'e" this is where the narrator and other fictional personae are introduced). The core story is developed in short rounded chapters (designed to hold the reader's interest), and a short concluding chapter formulates the moral. In "Vladyčnyj sud" Leskov continues the theme of an earlier story, "Na kraju sveta" (1876), which is also presented as an authentic reminiscence, by Bishop Nil' of Jaroslav,

12 N. S. Leskov, "Iz odnogo dorožnogo dnevnika," *Severnaja pčela*, no. 347, 349 etc. (1862). See also *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 87:115–16, fn. 11. "Iz odnogo dorožnogo dnevnika" are descriptions of the southwestern and western regions of the Russian Empire based on Leskov's correspondence with his uncle, Aleksandr Ja. Scott, for whom he worked and traveled in the 1850s.

13 "Ščast'e," p. 94; see also p. 96, fn. 8.

14 "Ščast'e," p. 111. Leskov accuses Dostoevskij of lacking "simplicity" through one of the participants in the literary circle which forms the outer frame of "Ščast'e."

a real person who died in 1874. Leskov uses Bishop Nil's story about his missionary work among the Mongolian tribesmen of Siberia to underscore his own thesis that church traditions and piety frequently have nothing to do with true Christian ideals. He points to the deleterious effect on the moral and social lives of Mongolian tribesmen in Siberia produced by the proselytizing Orthodox missionaries.[15]

"Na kraju sveta" provoked a flurry of attacks on Leskov by the Russian clergy, to which the author responded by writing "Vladyčnyj sud." Here he illuminates the theme that religiosity and moral purity are not intrinsically synonymous with an incident from his life as an army recruitment officer in Kiev. These were the years of the Crimean War, and among those recruited for the imperial Russian army were Jewish boys who were routinely christened while still in Kiev, with the full support of the Orthodox church. Then they were sent to the far corners of the Russian Empire, never to return to their birthplace or their parents. The author became personally involved in one such case when the father of a ten-year-old Jewish boy, illegally drafted, came to Kiev to plead for his young son's life. Ironically this practice of forced Christianization of Jewish recruits was zealously supported by Governor-General Vasil'čikov's wife, Ekaterina Alekseevna. Princess Vasil'čikova was renowned for her piety and charitable works. In addition to saving Jewish souls, she was responsible for the salvation of the souls of Kievan prostitutes, that colorful institution combining prostitution and traditional Cossack hospitality which Leskov describes in "Pečerskie antiki" with such nostalgia.[16] She organized a refuge for repented prostitutes called "Magdalinskie prijuty." The repentent ones, *kajuščijasja magdalinki*, were then married off to soldiers with a promised dowry of 100 rubles. Princess Vasil'čikova's

[15] Leskov, "Na kraju sveta," 5:451–517.

[16] Leskov, 7:134.

> Мне жаль, например, лишенного жизни Печерска и облегавших его урочищ, которые были застроены как попало, но очень живописно. Из них некоторые имели также замечательно своеобразное и характерное население, жившее неодобрительною и даже буйною жизнью в стародавнем запорожском духе. Таковы были, например, удалые Кресты и Ямки, где "мешкали бессоромние дiвчата," составлявшие любопытное соединение городской, культурной проституции с казаческим простоплетством и хлебосольством. К этим дамам, носившим не европейские, а национальные малороссийские уборы, или так называемое "простое платье," добрие люди хаживали в гости с своею "горилкою, с ковбасами, с салом и рыбицею," и "крестовские дiвчатки" из всей этой приносной провизии искусно готовили смачные снеди и проводили с своими посетителями часы удовольствий "по-фамильному."

philanthropy only compounded the evil, however. Once the soldiers obtained legal right over their "wives," they sent them back out into the streets, only now the *magdalinki* worked for their husbands rather than for themselves.

Leskov, then a mid-level bureaucrat, gained entry to Princess Vasil'čikov's circle through his involvement with amateur theater in Kiev, of which she was a benefactress. He writes in his memoirs that he achieved a measure of success in roles from Gogol's plays.[17]

The young conscript whose father came to Leskov's office seeking help was saved from the Russian army and Christianization by the just ruling of the metropolitan of Kiev, Philaret Amfiteatrov, of whom Leskov speaks with great respect and admiration.[18]

In "Figura," another framed story, written in 1889, Leskov again reaches into his memory of Kiev and his circle of friends and acquaintances for his central character. He is Vigura—nicknamed Figura for the handsome figure he cut in his youth—apparently a relative of Ivan Martynovič Vigura, professor of law at Kiev University. Since Leskov's uncle was a professor of medicine at the same institution, it is very probable that Leskov met Vigura, or Figura, at his uncle's house.

As the subtitle in the magazine edition, "iz vospominanij o pravednikax," indicates, Figura represents one of Leskov's righteous men, a *pravednik*, or genuinely good and morally pure human being. Figura had a farm just outside Kiev where Leskov says he visited him many times. He lived the life of a simple farmer, worked his own land, ate no meat, and befriended an errant woman and her daughter, allowing them to live in his house. Leskov calls Figura the founder of the Ukrainian Shtunda, an evangelical religious movement which spread through the southwestern region of Russia and the Ukraine in the early part of the nineteenth century.[19] Here and in other works Leskov expresses his admiration for this religious sect which, in his opinion, embraced true Christian ideals.[20]

17 Leskov, 6:116.

18 Philaret Amfiteatrov (1779–1857) was archbishop of Kiev from 1837 to 1857.

19 See William B. Edgerton's article on Leskov and the Shtundists, "Leskov, Paškov, the Štundists, and a Newly Discovered Letter," in *Orbis Scriptus: Dmitrij Tschiževskij zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich, 1966), pp. 187–99.

20 Leskov's fascination with the evangelical Ukrainian movement is reflected in his fiction. Christian puritan idealism is embodied in some of the members of his unique moral force for the good, that is, by the *pravedniki*, the "righteous ones." Vigura in "Figura" is a Shtundist. The mentor of the "unbaptized" priest, Savva, in "Nekreščenyj pop" is a Shtundist, and Savva himself embraces many of their

The other historic figure in the tale is General Osten-Saken (1790–1881), an undistinguished Russian general who fought in many wars, from the Napoleanic to the Crimean. The general was noted for his excessive piety (*nabožnost'*). His soldiers even satirized this fact in their army songs, some of which were recorded by Tolstoj, who knew him personally.[21] In the story Leskov uses the characters of Figura and General Osten-Saken as vehicles for his didactic message, a confrontation of true and false Christian ideals.

Artistically "Figura" is seriously flawed, perhaps because Leskov tried too hard to model his narrative after a typical Tolstojan didactic tale. The two main figures never take on human proportions. Figura is too virtuous, General Osten-Saken too hypocritical, the tale lifeless. Tolstoj called it "cold" (*xoloden*).[22]

These are a few samples of Leskov's brand of memoir writing, a style which evolved out of his artistic impulse for real people and unusual events, and his preference for open-ended decentralized composition. This flexible genre, whether described as illustrative memoir or story-feuilleton, is a fusion of fact and fiction which permitted Leskov to play out his two favorite roles, the role of a publicist-moralist and the role of an artist.

The narratives above indicate that Leskov remembered Kiev with a nostalgic love. The memory of the picturesque and golden-domed city of his youth remained with him all his life. Shortly before he died he wrote to his brother-in-law: "After the Ukraine, a comparable corner cannot be found in Russia (*Posle Ukrainy uže net ravnogo ugolka v Rossii*)."[23]

University of Chicago

tenets. The Shtundists play an important role in Leskov's last satire, "Zajačij remiz," also. Here the religious and nationalistic aspirations blend into one movement for Ukrainian independence. (See 9:570.)

21 Leskov, 8:623–24. See the note on the correspondence between Leskov and Lev Tolstoj on the subject of "Figura."

22 Leskov, 8:623–24.

23 Leskov to N. P. Kroxin (15 December 1888). Cited in Andrej Leskov's *Žizn' Nikolaja Leskova*, p. 97.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC STUDIES

Beauplan's *Description d'Ukranie*: A Bibliography of Editions and Translations

D. F. ESSAR and A. B. PERNAL

The name of Guillaume Le Vasseur, sieur de Beauplan (1600–1673), should be quite familiar even to persons whose knowledge of the Ukraine in the seventeenth century is superficial. By his outstanding cartographic achievements, this energetic Frenchman from Normandy created a place for the Ukraine on maps of Europe. Moreover, by describing the country with great accuracy and in a wealth of detail, he produced a written account that surpassed the descriptions of all his predecessors and contemporaries, both publicists and scholars, who treated a similar subject matter.

Beauplan the cartographer is undoubtedly a fascinating figure to study; we are interested, however, in examining a different person: Beauplan the author. Before composing his *Description* he had served seventeen years (from 1630 to 1647) as a military engineer and cartographer attached to the Crown army stationed in the Ukraine. In time he was promoted to the rank of captain of artillery.[1]

Beauplan exhibited more abilities as a soldier than a writer. In his career he demonstrated a great deal of proficiency in building fortresses, casting cannon, using gunpowder, and producing maps. Nevertheless, he did have a certain flair in the use of the quill. Certainly, he cannot be accused of boring his readers.

His book *Description d'Ukranie* comprises a series of frequently disjointed pieces, rather like the component parts of a mosaic, which describe a great many topics: cities, towns, villages, history, topography, climate, flora, fauna, Cossacks, Tatars, Polish magnates, nobles, serfs, elections of kings, customs, and religion. Since Beauplan recorded primarily his own experiences and

[1] A detailed list of major publications relating to Beauplan is provided by Wójcik, fn. 42, pp. 48–49. See item 25 of our bibliography.

observations, his account of the Ukraine is an extremely important primary source. To this day his book provides a wealth of information which is of great value to historians, geographers, and ethnographers.

* * *

We have found no clear indication that any part of the Beauplan text was published before 1651, despite the claims made in K. Estreicher's *Bibliografia polska*, in L.-B. Michaud's *Biographie universelle*, in *Les Sources de l'histoire de France* by E. Bourgeois and L. André, and in numerous other bibliographies. The origin of the claims seems to be an introductory note in the Rouen 1660 edition, entitled "Le Libraire au Lecteur," which begins: "Cher lecteur, il y a dix ans que l'auteur de ce livre me fit imprimer une centaine d'exemplaires, qui seulement furent présentés à ses amis." This declaration has been considered by many commentators to be an indication of a 1650 edition. Moreover, Estreicher reports the existence in the Biblioteka Czartoryskich of a copy of a 1640 edition,[2] which, he claims, is in reality a copy of the 1650 edition.[3] However, our investigations in the Biblioteka Czartoryskich (Cracow), British Library (London), Bibliothèque nationale (Paris), Biblioteka Narodowa (Warsaw), Biblioteka Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich Polskiej Akademii Nauk (Wrocław), Biblioteka Gdańska Polskiej Akademii Nauk (Gdańsk), Biblioteka Kórnicka Polskiej Akademii Nauk (Kórnik), the Library of Congress (Washington), and various other North American collections, as well as bibliographical inquiries and searches by letter in major European libraries (Amsterdam, Florence, Leningrad, Stockholm, the Vatican, Venice and Vienna), have produced no proof of the existence of a 1650 or earlier edition, much less a copy. We are forced to conclude that the note in the 1660 edition almost certainly refers to the 1651 edition. The first edition of Beauplan's text dates, therefore, from 1651; the second, a revised and expanded version, from 1660.[4]

[2] This mysterious book has the same title as the 1651 edition and comprises exactly the same number of pages as the 1660 edition. Its title page does not reveal the publisher's name. Moreover, its date of publication appears in Arabic, rather than in Roman numerals. See *Bibliografia polska*, pt. 3, vol. 1 (Cracow, 1891), p. 423.

[3] "Wyszło w 100 egzempl[arzach]. W rzeczywistości wydane [w] 1650 [roku], jak to stoi w przedmowie do edycyi drugiej." *Bibliografia polska*, pt. 3, vol. 1, p. 423.

[4] Among modern historians only Kersten cites the 1640 edition. This is,

Editions and translations of the Beauplan text may be divided into two groups. The first and smaller group, comprising eight items, consists of the 1651 edition and the re-edition and several translations produced by Joan Blaeu, the Dutch publisher. The second group comprises the 1660 edition and subsequent versions of it. This group contains a number of French editions as well as translations into five other languages. Since the 1660 text is far more readily available and contains thirty-three pages of new material of great interest to the average reader, it is not surprising that the second French edition is the one favored by later translators and editors.

The following list of editions and translations includes all versions that we have been able to locate of the entire texts of both the first and second French editions. The numbered designation of each edition includes the following items: the name of editor or translator (or "Beauplan," in the case of unedited texts); the place of publication; the date of publication (of the Beauplan text, in the case of collections including a number of authors and published over several years); and the language of the edition in question.

The following bibliography does not include any of the numerous editions of separately published extracts of the Beauplan text that we have located. With the exception of items 6 and 26, all works cited in this bibliography present either the complete text of the French editions of 1651 or 1660, with or without prefatory and dedicatory notes, or an integral translation of one or the other text. Our forthcoming edition of the French text and new English translation will be accompanied by a complete bibliography of these published extracts.

Brandon University

* * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Beauplan: Rouen 1651 (French)

DESCRIPTION / DES CONTREES / DV ROYAVME DE / POLOGNE, / CONTENVËS DEPVIS / les confins de la Moscouie, iusques / aux limites de la

undoubtedly, a result of his mistaken reference to Estreicher's bibliographic entry. See Adam Kersten, *Stefan Czarniecki, 1599–1655* (Warsaw, 1963), pp. 110, fn. 73; 533.

Transilvanie. / Par le Sieur de BEAVPLAN. / [ornament] / A ROVEN, / Chez IACQVES CAILLOÜÉ, tenant / sa boutique dans la Cour du Palais. / [single rule] / M. DC. LI.

pp. [viii].79.[i]; 20 x 15 cm; contains seven illustrations.

This, the first French edition, of which only about 100 copies were printed, is now quite rare. It contains, in addition to the text itself, a dedicatory note, a note entitled "*AVX LECTEVRS.*", and a further note entitled "ADVERTISSEMENT."

2. Beauplan: Rouen 1660 (French)

DESCRIPTION / D'VKRANIE, / QVI SONT PLVSIEVRS / Prouinces du Royaume de / Pologne. / CONTENVËS DEPVIS / les confins de la Moscouie, iusques / aux limites de la Transilvanie. / *ENSEMBLE LEVRS MOEVRS, / façons de viures, & de faire la Guerre.* / Par le Sieur de BEAVPLAN. / [ornament] / A ROVEN, / Chez IACQVES CAILLOÜÉ, dans / la Cour du Palais / [single rule] / M. DC. LX.

pp. [viii]. 1–48, 47, 50–51, 50–51, 54–55, 54, 57–112; 19 x 14 cm; contains eight illustrations and one map.

This second French edition contains, in addition to a revised and enlarged text, the same dedicatory note as the 1651 edition, an "*AVERTISSEMENT / aux Lecteurs.*" (the same as the note "*AVX LECTEVRS.*" in the 1651 edition), and a further note, "*LE LIBRAIRE / au Lecteur.*" 3. Beauplan: Rouen 1661 (French)[5]

DESCRIPTION / D'VKRANIE, / QVI SONT PLVSIEVRS / Prouinces du Royaume de / Pologne. / CONTENVËS DEPVIS / les Confins de la Moscouie, iusques / aux limites de la Transilvanie. / *ENSEMBLE LEVRS MOEVRS, / façons de viures, et de faire la Guerre.* / Par le Sieur de BEAVPLAN. / [ornament] / *à Roüen, & se vend* / A PARIS, / Chez SIMON

[5] According to the *Deutscher Gesamtkatalog: herausgegeben von der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek*, vol. 14 (Berlin: Preussische Druckerei- und Verlags-Aktiengesellschaft, 1939), column 97 (entry under "Beauplan, Guillaume Le Vasseur Sieur de"), a copy of a 1662 edition was contained in the collections of the Preussische Staatsbibliothek (Berlin). The call number given for the volume is Uf 8036. In the catalogue, the 1662 volume is indicated as bearing the same title as the 1660 edition. The following additional precisions are given: "Roüen, Cailloüé 1662. 112 S. 8^{o}". In reply to our inquiry, both the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in West Berlin and the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in East Berlin have stated that this volume cannot be located in their collections. We suspect that if this volume in fact exists, it is another re-edition of the 1660 edition, with either a new title page, or simply a modified date (as is the case with the 1673 edition; see item 10 of this bibliography).

LE SOVRD, ruë S. Iacques, / à l'Image Saint Pierre. / [single rule] / M. DC. LXI.

Pagination and format are the same as for item 2; the text has been printed from the same formes, and the two editions are identical, except for the title page and one correction.

4. Blaeu: Amsterdam 1662 (Latin)[6]

A. DESCRIPTIO / BORYSTHENIS / FLVVII, / vulgo NIEPR, sive DNIEPR dicti: / simul & de Moribus / COSACORVM ZAPOROVIORVM.

B. CHERSONESVS / TAURICA, / ET / TARTARIA PRÆCOPENSIS, / VEL CRIMEA.

These two texts are contained in a collection bearing the following general title page in volume I: ATLAS / MAIOR, / SIVE / COSMOGRAPHIA / BLAVIANA, / QVA / SOLVM, SALVM, / CŒLVM, / ACCVRATISSIME / DESCRIBVNTVR.

Volume II in this collection bears the following title page: GEOGRAPHIÆ / BLAVIANÆ / VOLVMEN SECVNDVM, / QVO / LIB. III, IV, V, VI, VII, / EUROPÆ / CONTINENTVR / [ornament] / AMSTELÆDAMI, / Labore & Sumptibus / IOANNIS BLAEV, / M DC LXII.

Text A is found in the section entitled: POLONIA, / QVÆ EST / EUROPÆ / LIBER QVINTVS.

pp. 51–67; 53 x 35 cm; contains four maps and four illustrations.

Text B is found in the section entitled: REGIONES / ORIENTALES / VLTRA / GERMANIAM / CIRCA DANVBIVM. / EUROPÆ / LIBER SEXTVS.

pp. 1–7; same format as above; contains one map and three illustrations.

Text A and text B constitute a complete translation of the 1651 edition. The introductory comment on page 51 is not by Beauplan.

[6] The Blaeu atlases have been studied in detail by Dr. Ir. C. Koeman. We are particularly indebted to him for his *Joan Blaeu and his Grand Atlas* (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1970). He mentions (p. 50) two known copies of the *Atlas* with a German text, one housed in the Staatsbibliothek at Bamberg, the other in the library of the Geographisches Institut at the University of Göttingen. The personnel of both libraries responded generously to our requests for information and photocopies. However, the texts in these atlases pertaining to the Crimea are not by Beauplan. Similarly the Turkish manuscript atlas preserved in the Topkapi Serail Museum in Istanbul, mentioned by Koeman on p. 51, does not contain any of the Beauplan texts. We received this information from the director of the museum, who kindly answered our request.

5. Blaeu: Amsterdam 1663 (French)

A. DESCRIPTION / DV FLEVVE / BORYSTHENE, / vulgairement appellé / NIEPR ou DNIEPR; / & des mœurs des / COSAQVES ZAPORAVIENS.

B. LA CHERSONESE / TAURIQUE, / ET / TARTARIE PRECOPENSE, / OV CRIME.

The general title page of the collection appears in volume I as follows: LE GRAND / ATLAS, / OV / COSMOGRAPHIE / BLAVIANE, / EN LAQVELLE / EST EXACTEMENT / DESCRITTE / LA TERRE, / LA MER, / ET / LE CIEL.

Volume II bears the following title page: SECOND VOLVME / DE LA / GEOGRAPHIE / BLAVIANE, / CONTENANT / LE / III, IV, V, VI, & VII LIVRE / DE L'EUROPE. / [ornament] / A AMSTERDAM, / Chez JEAN BLAEU. / MDCLXIII.

Text A is found in the section entitled: POLOGNE, / QVI EST / LE V. LIVRE / DE L'EUROPE.

pp. 57–74; 53 x 32 cm; contains four maps and four illustrations.

Text B is found in the section entitled: REGIONS / ORIENTALES / AV DELÀ / DE L'ALEMAGNE / PREZ LE DANVBE. / SIXIÉME LIVRE / DE L'EUROPE.

pp. 1–7; same format as A; contains one map and three illustrations.

Text A and text B constitute a complete republication of the 1651 edition. The introductory comment on page 57 is not by Beauplan.

6. Blaeu: Amsterdam 1664 (Dutch)

Beschrijving van de Rivier / BORYSTHENES, / gemeenelijck genoemt / NIEPR oft DNIEPR; / en van de zeden der / ZAPOROVISCHE COSACKEN.

The general title page of the collection containing this text appears in volume I as follows: J. BLAEUS / GROOTEN / ATLAS, / OFT / WERELT- / BESCHRYVING, / IN WELCKE / 't AERDRYCK, / DE ZEE, / EN / HEMEL, / WORT VERTOONT / EN / BESCHREVEN.

A second title page of volume I appears as follows: EERSTE DEEL / DES / AERDKLOOTS- / BESCHRYVING, / INHOVDENDE / DE / AFBEELDINGEN / EN / BESCHRYVINGEN / DER LANDEN / OP HET / AERDRYCK: / [ornament] / Uytgegeven / t'AMSTERDAM, / By JOAN BLAEV, / M DC LXIIII.

pp. 29 recto - 38 verso (only the recto of each leaf is numbered; there are therefore twenty pages of text); 56 x 37 cm; contains four maps and four illustrations.

(A section following the above text, entitled "TAVRICA CHERSONESUS, / Ofte / PRECOPENSER TARTARIE." is not a translation of Beauplan.)

The text is a translation of part of the 1651 edition. The introductory

comment on page 29 recto is not by Beauplan.

7. Blaeu: Amsterdam [1665] (Spanish)[7]

A. Descripcion del Rio / Boristhenes, / Que vulgarmente dicen NIEPER o DNIEPER, / desde Kiow hasta la mar en que se descarga; / DE LOS / COSACOS ZAPOROVIOS, / y sus Costumbres, &c.

B. LA CHERSONESO / TAURICA, / Y / TARTARIA PRECOPENSE, / O CRIME.

The two texts are found in the second volume of this, the first Spanish edition of the Blaeu *Atlas.* Neither volume I nor volume II bears a title page in the set examined (Library of Congress).

Text A: pp. 43–64; 57 x 35 cm; contains four maps and four illustrations.

Text B: pp. 1–10; same format as A; contains one map and three illustrations.

Text A and text B constitute a complete translation of the 1651 edition. The introductory comment mentioned for item 4 is not present in this translation.

8. Blaeu: Amsterdam 1667 (French)

This edition is a reissue of the Amsterdam 1663 French edition. The texts and title pages of the two editions do not differ, except for the date; in this edition the title page of volume II bears the date "M DC LXVII."

The two Beauplan texts and their illustrations, maps, pagination, and format are identical in the two editions.

9. Blaeu: Amsterdam [1672] (Spanish)

A. Descripcion del Rio / BORISTHENES, / Que vulgarmente dizen NIEPER o DNIEPER, / desde Kiow hasta la Mar en que se descarga; / DE LOS / COSACOS ZAPOROVIOS, / y sus Costumbres, &c.

B. LA CHERSONESO / TAURICA, / Y / TARTARIA PRECOPENSE, / O CRIME.

[7] Koeman points out (*Joan Blaeu and his Grand Atlas*, pp. 50–51) the two Spanish editions we have examined. The second of these editions (item 9 in this bibliography) may be identified by the maps, which are printed on sheets bearing texts in French, Latin, or Dutch on the reverse side. Another way to determine whether a particular Spanish version of the Beauplan text is of the first or second edition is to see whether the third word of the third line of the title of the Beauplan text appears as "dicen" (first edition) or "dizen" (second edition). Similarly, in the fourth line of this title, the first edition has "mar" while the second has "Mar."

The two texts are again found in the second volume of this, the second Spanish edition of the Blaeu *Atlas*. Volume I in the set examined (British Library) bears no title page. Volume II bears the following title page: ATLAS MAYOR / O / GEOGRAPHIA / BLAVIANA: / Que contiene las Cartas, y de- / scripciones de Partes / ORIENTALES / DE / EUROPA. / En AMSTERDAM, / En la Officina BLAVIANA. (The text of the title page is contained in the central cartouche of a large engraving.)

Text A: pp. 43–64; 57 x 35 cm; contains four maps and four illustrations. (These maps are backed by the French text. The Spanish text has been printed on a separate sheet which has been pasted over the French text in each case.) In the copy examined, four other maps (later republished by Liaskoronskii; see item 22 in this bibliography) are bound after text A.

Text B: pp. 1–10; same format as A; contains one map and three illustrations.

Texts A and B constitute a complete translation of the 1651 edition. The introductory comment mentioned for item 4 is again not present in this translation.

10. Beauplan: Rouen 1673 (French)

This edition is a reissue of the Rouen 1660 French edition. Apart from two corrections, the texts of the two editions are identical and have been printed from the same formes.

On the title page, the Roman numerals "XIII." have been added to give the date "M. DC. LX. XIII."

11. Churchill: London 1704 (English)

A / DESCRIPTION / OF / UKRAINE, / CONTAINING SEVERAL / PROVINCES / OF THE / Kingdom of Poland, / Lying between the Confines of *Mus- / covy*, and the Borders of *Transyl- / vania.* / Together with their Customs, Manner of Life, and / how they manage their Wars. / [single rule] / *Written in* French *by the* Sieur de BEAUPLAN. / [single rule]

This text is contained in volume I of a four-volume collection. Volume I bears the following title page: A / COLLECTION / OF / Voyages and Travels, / Some now first Printed from *Original / Manuscripts.* / Others Translated out of Foreign Languages, and now / first Publish'd in *English.* / [. . .] / Vol. I. / [single rule] / *LONDON*; / Printed for AWNSHAM and JOHN CHURCHILL at the Black / Swan in *Pater-noster-Row.* MDCCIV. (The text of the title page is framed with a double rule.)

pp. 571–610; 49 x 26 cm; contains eight illustrations.

This text, the first integral translation of Beauplan into English, is based on the Rouen 1660 edition. The text alone appears, without the

dedicatory and introductory comments of the 1660 edition.

12. Churchill: London 1732 (English)

A / DESCRIPTION / OF / UKRAINE, / Containing Several / PROVINCES / OF THE / Kingdom of *Poland,* / Lying between the Confines of *Muscovy,* / and the Borders of *Transylvania.* / Together with their Customs, Manner of Life, and / how they manage their Wars. / *Written in* French *by the* Sieur de BEAUPLAN.

The text is contained in the first volume of a six-volume edition. Volume I bears the following title page: A / COLLECTION / OF / Voyages and Travels, / SOME / Now first Printed from *Original Manuscripts,* / OTHERS / Now first Published in ENGLISH. / In Six VOLUMES / [. . .] / VOL. I. / [single rule] / *LONDON*: / Printed by Assignment from Mess^{rs}. CHURCHILL / [. . .] / [. . .] MDCCXXXII.

pp. 515–551 (the second page numbered 522 should be numbered 524); 36 x 23 cm; contains eight illustrations.

This edition contains the same text, completely reset, as the 1704 edition.

13. Churchill: London 1744 (English)

A / DESCRIPTION / OF / UKRAINE, / Containing Several / PROVINCES / OF THE / Kingdom of Poland, / Lying between the Confines of *Muscovy,* / and the Borders of *Transylvania.* / Together with their Customs, Manner of Life, / and how they manage their Wars. / *Written in* French *by the Sieur* DE BEAUPLAN. / [. . . .]

The text is contained in the first volume of another six-volume edition. Volume I bears the following title page, printed in black and red: A / COLLECTION OF / Voyages and Travels, / SOME / Now first Printed from *Original Manuscripts,* / OTHERS / Now first Published in ENGLISH. / In SIX VOLUMES / [. . .] / The THIRD EDITION / [single rule] / VOL. I / [double rule] / *LONDON*: / Printed by Assignment from Mess^{rs}. CHURCHILL, / [. . .] / MDCCXLIV.

pp. 445–481; 36 x 23 cm; contains eight illustrations.

This edition contains the same text as the other two editions, but the type has been completely reset.

14. Churchill: London 1752 (English)

The Beauplan text in this eight-volume collection, again contained in volume I, is identical to that of the 1744 edition of the Churchill *Collection.* It was printed from the same formes.

Volume I of this edition bears the following title page: A / COLLECTION /

OF / Voyages and Travels, / Some now FIRST PRINTED from / ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS, / OTHERS / Now First Published in ENGLISH. / IN EIGHT VOLUMES / [. . .] / VOL. I. / [double rule] / *LONDON*: / Printed by Assignment from Messieurs CHURCHILL, / For THOMAS OSBORNE in *Gray's-Inn.* MDCCLII.

The pagination, format, illustrations, and content of this edition are identical to the 1744 edition.

15. Mizler von Kolof: Warsaw 1769 (Latin)

DESCRIPTIO VKRAINÆ / Variis ex provinciis Regni Poloniæ consistentis, a confini- / bus Moscoviæ Transylvaniæ vsque limites patentis, simul / incolarum mores, rationem viuendi, bellandique, inse conti- / nentis, per Dominum de BEAUPLAN. *Rothomagi* apud Ia- / cobum Cailloué, in curia palatii. M. DC. LX. Ex Gallico idi- / omate in Latinum nunc translata.

This text is contained in the second volume of a two-volume collection. Volume I bears the following title page: HISTORIARUM / POLONIÆ / ET / MAGNI DUCATUS LITUANIÆ / SCRIPTORUM / QUOTQUOT AB INITIO REIPUBLICÆ POLONÆ AD NOSTRA / VSQUE TEMPORA EXTANT OMNIUM / COLLECTIO MAGNA / [. . .] / EDIDIT VARIAS ANNOTATIONES ADIECIT AC PRÆFATUS EST / LAUR. MIZLERUS DE KOLOF / REGNI POLONIÆ HISTORIOGRAPHUS, IN SERENISS. REGIS POLON. AULA / CONSILIARIUS ET MEDICUS / CUM INDICE LOCUPLETISSIMO / [ornamental rule] / TOMUS PRIMUS / CONTINENS SCRIPTORES TOPOGRAPHICOS / [engraving] / *CVM SERENISSIMI REGIS POLONIARVM PRIVILEGIO* / [single rule] / VARSAVIÆ / SUMPTIBUS TYPOGRAPHIÆ MIZLERIANÆ / ANNO MDCCLXI.

Volume II bears the following title page: HISTORIARVM / POLONIAE / ET / MAGNI DVCATVS LITHVANIAE / SCRIPTORVM / QVOTQVOT AB INITIO REIPVBLICAE POLONAE AD / NOSTRA VSQVE TEMPORA EXTANT OMNIVM / COLLECTIO MAGNA / [. . .] / EDIDIT, ANNOTATIONES ADIECIT AC PRAEFATVS EST / LAVR. MIZLERVS DE KOLOF / POLONIAE HISTORIOGRAPHVS ET IN SERENISS. POLON. REGIS AVLA / CONSILIARIVS, MEDICVS VARSAVIENSIS / CVM INDICE LOCVPLETISSIMO / [single rule] / TOMVS SECVNDVS / CONTINENS RESIDVOS SCRIPTORES TOPOGRAPHICOS / [engraving] / *CVM SERENISSIMI REGIS POLONIARVM PRIVILEGIO* / [single rule] / VARSAVIAE / SVMPTIBVS TYPOGRAPHIAE MIZLERIANAE / ANNO MDCCLXVIIII.

pp. (in vol. II) 49–84; 34 x 21 cm; contains no illustrations or maps.

The text is a faithful rendering of the Rouen 1660 edition, including dedicatory and introductory notes. The marginal notes of the 1660 edition, however, are not included. A note appearing at the end of the Beauplan text gives a brief account of the life of Beauplan, and mentions the 1704 Churchill edition, quoting the title page of the Beauplan text in that

edition as concluding, "Written in French by the *Sieur de Beauplan*, in 1640" (p. 83). The same information is given by Wójcik (item 25 in this bibliography, p. 43, number 6). Since none of the three 1704 editions of Churchill we have examined have this indication "in 1640," we must conclude that their information is not correct.

16. Moeller: Wrocław 1780 (German)

[In Gothic type] Wilhelm le Vasseur, Sieur / de Beauplan, / Beschreibung / der / Ukraine, der Krim, / und deren Einwohner. / [double rule] / Aus dem Französischen überfezt / und / nebst einem Anhange / der / die Ukraine, und die Budziackische / Tartaren betrift, / und / aus dem Tagebuche eines deutschen Prinzen, / und eines Schwedischen Kavaliers / gezogen worden, / herausgegeben / von / Johann Wilhelm Moeller, / D. d. A. / [single rule] / Mit Kupfern. / [ornamental rule] / Breslau, / bey Wilhelm Gottlieb Korn. / 1780.

pp. [xii]. 236; 18 x 11 cm; contains on pp. 1–157 a translation of the 1660 Beauplan text, not including dedicatory and introductory notes; there are two illustrations bound at the back of the book.

This edition is the first and only German translation of the 1660 text.

17. Niemcewicz: Warsaw 1822 (Polish)

CIEKAWE OPISANIE / UKRAINY POLSKIEY / I RZEKI DNIEPRU / OD KIIOWA, AŻ DO MIEYSCA GDZIE RZE- / KA TA WRZUCA SIĘ W MORZE. / *Przez P. Beauplan Jndżyniera w służbie Kró- / lów Polskich, Zygm. III. Wladys. IV. Jana / Kazimierza.*

The text appears in volume III of a six-volume collection. Volume I bears the following title page: ZBIÓR / PAMIĘTNIKÓW HISTORYCZNYCH / O / DAWNÉJ POLSZCZE / Z RĘKOPISMÓW, TUDZIEŻ DZIEŁ / W RÓŻNYCH JĘZYKACH O POLSZCZE WYDANYCH ORAZ Z / LISTAMI ORYGINALNEMI KRÓLÓW I ZNAKOMITYCH LUDZI / W KRAIU NASZYM, / PRZEZ J. U. NIEMCEWICZA. / [. . .] / TOM I. / [single rule] / W WARSZAWIE, / DRUKIEM N. GLÜCKSBERGA, / KSIĘGARZA I TYPOGRAFA KRÓLEW: UNIWERSYTETU. / 1822.

Volume III bears the same title page, except for the indication "TOM III."

pp. (in volume III) 336–406; 19 x 12 cm; contains one map (bound at the back of volume III) but no illustrations.

The text is that of the 1660 edition, without dedicatory and introductory notes. This is the first Polish edition.

18. Ustrialov: St. Petersburg 1832 (Russian)

ОПИСАНІЕ / [in ornamental type] / УКРАЙНЫ. / СОЧИНЕНІЕ / БОПЛАНА. / [ornament] / Переводъ съ Французскаго [in italics]. / [ornamental rule] / САНКТПЕТЕРБУРГЪ. / ВЪ ТИПОГРАФІИ КАРЛА КРАЙЯ. / 1832.

pp. xx.179.[i]; 22 x 14 cm; contains eight illustrations, bound at the end of the book.

This is the first Russian translation of the Beauplan text of 1660.[8] It includes the dedicatory and introductory notes. The editor's name is missing from the title page. His initials (F. U.) are given on p. xi.

19. Niemcewicz: Leipzig 1839 (Polish)

CIEKAWE OPISANIE / UKRAINY POLSKIEJ / I RZEKI DNIEPRU / OD KIJOWA, AŻ DO MIEJSCA / GDZIE RZEKA TA WRZUCA SIĘ W MORZE. / PRZEZ / P. BEAUPLAN / INDŻYNIERA W SŁUŻBIE KRÓLÓW POLSKICH, ZYGMUNTA III. / WŁADYSŁAWA IV. JANA KAZIMIERZA. / [single rule]

The text is contained in volume III of a five-volume collection. Volume I bears the following title page: ZBIÓR / PAMIĘTNIKÓW HISTORYCZNYCH / O / DAWNEJ POLSZCZE / Z RĘKOPISMÓW, TUDZIEŻ DZIEŁ / W RÓŻNYCH JĘZYKACH O POLSZCZE WYDANYCH, ORAZ / Z LISTAMI ORYGINALNEMI KRÓLÓW I ZNAKOMITYCH / LUDZI W KRAJU NASZYM, / PRZEZ / J. U. NIEMCEWICZA. / [single rule] / WYDANIE NOWE / JANA NEP. BOBROWICZA. / TOM I. / [in Gothic] Z popiersiem J. U. Niemcęwicza. / [double rule] / W LIPSKU, / NAKŁADEM I DRUKIEM BREITKOPFA I HAERTELA. / 1838.

The title page of volume III is identical to that of volume I, except for the last part, which appears as follows: [. . .] TOM III. / [double rule] / W LIPSKU, / NAKŁADEM I DRUKIEM BREITKOPFA I HAERTELA. / 1839.

pp. (in volume III) 239–288; 22.5 x 13.5 cm; no maps or illustrations. This, the second Polish edition, reproduces the text of the first.

20. Galitzin: Paris 1861 (French)

[In red and black] DESCRIPTION / DE / L'VKRANIE / DEPVIS LES CONFINS DE LA MOSCOVIE / JVSQV'AVX LIMITES DE LA TRANSYLVANIE / PAR / LE CHEVALIER DE BEAVPLAN / [single rule] / NOVVELLE ÉDITION / publiée par / LE PRINCE AVGVSTIN GALITZIN / [ornament] /

[8] According to L. Finkel's *Bibliografia historii polskiej* (Warsaw, 1955 [reprint of the 1891 edition]), vol. 1, p. 453, no. 8193, Beauplan's *Description* was published in "Drewnyje zapiski, Moskwa, 1822." Unfortunately, we have not been able to examine this publication. (Furthermore, I. F. Grigorieva, Chief of the Foreign Acquisitions and International Exchange Section at the Publichnaia Biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina in Leningrad, recently informed us that such a periodical never existed.)

PARIS / J. TECHNER, LIBRAIRE / RVE DE L'ARBRE-SEC, 52 / M DCCC LXI

pp. [iv]. xv. [i]. 203. [v]; 16 x 10 cm; contains no map or illustrations.

This edition reproduces the 1660 text, including dedicatory and introductory notes.

21. Antonovich: Kiev 1896 (Russian)

ОПИСАНІЕ УКРАИНЫ БОПЛАНА. / 1630–1648

The text appears as part VI of a collection entitled:

МЕМУАРЫ / ОТНОСЯЩІЕСЯ / КЪ ИСТОРІИ ЮЖНОЙ РУСИ. / [ornamental rule] / ВЫПУСКЪ II (ПЕРВАЯ ПОЛОВИНА XVII СТ.). / [. . .] / ПЕРЕВОДЪ К. МЕЛЬНИКЪ / (ПОДЪ РЕДАКЦІЕЮ В. АНТОНОВИЧА) / [ornamental rule] / КІЕВЪ. / ТИПОГРАФІЯ КОРЧАКЪ-НОВИЦКАГО. / МИХАЙЛОВСКАЯ УЛИЦА, ДОМ Nº 4, / 1896

pp. 289–388; contains two illustrations.

This version is the second Russian translation of the 1660 Beauplan text.

22. Liaskoronskii: Kiev 1901 (Russian)

[In ornamental sloping type] В. Т. Ляскоронскій. / [single rule] / ГИЛЬОМЪ ЛЕВАССЕРЪ-ДЕ-БОПЛАНЪ / И ЕГО / ИСТОРИКО-ГЕОГРАФИЧЕСКІЕ ТРУДЫ / ОТНОСИТЕЛЬНО ЮЖНОЙ РОССІИ. / [ornamental rule] I. Описаніе Украины II. Карты Украины. / [ornamental rule] / КІЕВЪ. / Типографія И. И. Чоколова, Фундуклеевская улица, домъ Nº 22. / 1901.

pp. x.44.37.[i]; 37 x 24 cm; contains five maps.

This, the third Russian edition, contains a new translation of the 1660 Beauplan text, including dedicatory and introductory notes. The volume also contains a lengthy essay (the 37-page section noted above) on Beauplan's maps of the Ukraine.

23. Petryshyn: New York 1959 (English)

A / DESCRIPTION / OF / UKRAINE, / by / Guillaume le Vasseur Sieur de Beauplan / [single rule] / New York - 1959

pp. xii. 445–481; 36 x 28 cm; contains five maps.

This edition is a reprint of the Beauplan text that appeared in the 1744 edition of the Churchill *Collection* (item 13 in this bibliography). A short introductory essay and bibliography by J. T. Petryshyn and a note on Beauplan's maps by Bohdan Krawciw have been added. It was published in 1959 by the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms of

Ukraine, Inc.

24. Blaeu: Amsterdam 1967 (French)

This edition is a facsimile reprint of the Amsterdam 1663 French edition of Blaeu's *Grand Atlas* (item 6 in this bibliography). It was published in 1967 in Amsterdam by Theatrum Orbis Terrarum.

25. Wójcik: Warsaw 1972 (Polish)

OPISANIE UKRAINY, / KTÓRĄ TWORZĄ LICZNE / DZIELNICE KRÓLESTWA / POLSKIEGO POCZĄWSZY / OD KRESÓW MOSKWY / PO GRANICE TRANSYLWANII, / WRAZ Z ICH OBYCZAJAMI, / SPOSOBEM ŻYCIA TUDZIEŻ / PROWADZENIA WOJEN. / PRZEZ IMĆ PANA / DE BEAUPLAN DOKONANE / W ROUEN U JACQUES / CAILLOÜE W OFICYNIE / PAŁACOWEJ MDCLX

This translation is found in a volume bearing the following title page: ERYKA LASSOTY / i / WILHELMA BEAUPLANA / OPISY UKRAINY / W PRZEKŁADZIE / ZOFII STASIEWSKIEJ / i / STEFANA MELLERA / POD REDAKCJĄ, / ZE WSTĘPEM I KOMENTARZAMI / ZBIGNIEWA WÓJCIKA / PAŃSTWOWY INSTYTUT WYDAWNICZY

The obverse of page 211 bears the following collophon: PRINTED IN POLAND / Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warszawa 1972 [. . . .]

pp. 101–198; 20.5 x 14 cm; contains numerous illustrations and two maps.

The Beauplan text that appears in this edition is that of 1660, including dedicatory and introductory notes. It has been translated by Stefan Meller.

26. Isaievych: Lviv 1981 (Ukrainian)

ГІЙОМ ЛЕВАССЕР / де БОПЛАН / ОПИС УКРАЇНИ, / КІЛЬКОХ ПРОВІНЦІЙ КОРОЛІВСТВА / ПОЛЬСЬКОГО, ЩО ТЯГНУТЬСЯ ВІД / КОРДОНІВ МОСКОВІЇ ДО ГРАНИЦЬ / ТРАНСІЛЬВАНІЇ, РАЗОМ З ЇХНІМИ / ЗВИЧАЯМИ, СПОСОБОМ ЖИТТЯ / І ВЕДЕННЯ ВОЄН

pp. 54–88; 25.5 x 15 cm; contains reproductions of seven engravings.

This is a translation by Iarema Kravets' of pp. 1–68, 72–89 of most of the 1660 Beauplan text. It appears in a periodical entitled: ЖОВТЕНЬ / ЛІТЕРАТУРНО-МИСТЕЦЬКИЙ / ТА ГРОМАДСЬКО-ПОЛІТИЧНИЙ / ЩОМІСЯЧНИЙ ЖУРНАЛ / СПІЛКИ ПИСЬМЕННИКІВ УКРАЇНИ, 1981, no. 4 (438) (April), pp. 54–88. The pages omitted in this translation, namely, those dealing with Orthodox Easter celebrations and with the election of Polish kings and life among the Polish nobility, are precisely those

added by Beauplan in 1660 to the shorter 1651 edition. This Ukrainian translation thus concentrates on those sections of the *Description* dealing with the Ukraine and the Crimea, with the Cossacks and the Tatars.

The translation is preceded (pp. 52–53) by a short introductory essay by Iaroslav Isaievych entitled: БОПЛАН / І / ЙОГО / "Опис України..."

REVIEW ARTICLE

The Publication of Documents on the Crimean Khanate in the Topkapı Sarayı: New Sources for the History of the Black Sea Basin

VICTOR OSTAPCHUK

LE KHANAT DE CRIMÉE DANS LES ARCHIVES DU MUSÉE DU PALAIS DE TOPKAPI. By *Alexandre Bennigsen, Pertev Naili Boratav, Dilek Desaive, Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay*. Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1978. 458 pp., 3 pl. FF 140.

I.

For some time now, students of early modern Eastern Europe, recognizing the important role of the Crimean Khanate in the region, have strived to overcome the parochial attitudes that have hindered an objective study of the khanate. Its archives must at present be regarded as lost, although apparently a substantial portion of them survived into the nineteenth century in the Crimea[1] and in Odessa and may still exist somewhere in the repositories of Odessa, Kiev, Leningrad, or Moscow.[2] Most of the Crimean chronicles remain little known or used, for lack of good editions and translations. As a result,

[1] V. D. Smirnov relates that during a visit to the Crimea in 1886, he chanced upon about a hundred local court records (*qāḍī siğill defters*?) dated from the mid-sixteenth century to the end of the khanate (1783) in the archive of the Simferopol' gubernia. Judging by their code numbers, Smirnov assumes that there must have been many more. V. D. Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo pod verxovenstvom Otomanskoj Porty do načala XVIII veka* (St. Petersburg, 1887), pp. xxxiii–xxxiv. Unfortunately, neither Smirnov nor anyone else has examined these records, and their present location or fate is unknown.

[2] The collection of the former Odessa Society of History and Antiquities also contained some Crimean Tatar documents which may have been remnants of the archive of the Crimean Khanate. After the Second World War, the society's collection was reorganized, the Slavic materials being sent to Kiev and the Oriental materials to Leningrad. See the forthcoming volume by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories of the USSR: The Ukraine and Moldavia,* to be published by the Princeton University Press.

much of the scholarly work done on the khanate to date has been based on the surviving materials of the khanate's neighbors. Although scholars recognize that viewing the khanate through foreign eyes is one reason for the distortions in its history, we have nevertheless been obliged to substitute for the lost or inaccessible Crimean sources with the foreign ones.

Very little new documentary source material has come to light since the monumental source publications of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Despite the unpublished treasures lying in East European archives, the publication of Russian, Polish, Romanian, and other sources relating to the Crimea is at a respectably advanced stage when compared with the dearth of publications from Ottoman archives. Yet, the latter materials may well be the richest and best sources on the Crimean Khanate, which was so closely connected with the Ottoman Empire.

Happily, the appearance of *Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapı* is a major step towards making Ottoman sources on the history of Eastern Europe accessible to the non-Ottomanist. The book is the product of ongoing work on Ottoman sources by a team of experts at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. Because the major reason for the underutilization of the Ottoman sources has been their extreme paleographic and philological difficulties, only a team of specialists, such as the one centered in Paris, can be expected to produce a reliable edition of these sources. Since the 1960s, the results of this team's efforts have been made available in its members' occasional publications of documents and commentaries (most often in the *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*). Now the present volume incorporates many of their past findings and adds many new ones.

Le Khanat de Crimée includes only documents relating to the Crimean Khanate that are preserved in the archive of the museum of the Topkapı Sarayı (*Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi*), the former residence of the Ottoman sultans in Istanbul. The great majority of these documents are original letters from Crimean khans and notables to the Ottoman Porte. Others are copies of Crimean letters by Ottoman scribes, reports by Ottoman officials in and around the Crimea, communications by viziers to the sultan, etc. The original Crimean letters to the Porte form the largest collection of such documents published thus far; it is very valuable because the documents bear discernible and uniform internal characteristics that have not been treated in the diplomatics literature.[3] On the other hand, when one considers the closeness and importance of the Crimean-Ottoman relationship, which lasted from the middle of the fifteenth to the end of the eighteenth century, it is very surprising that fewer than 200 documents concerned with this relationship are preserved

[3] To date only the diplomatics of writings from the Ottoman Porte *to* Crimean khans has been analyzed. I am, however, preparing an article on the *'arẓ*-type report and the diplomatics of Crimean writings addressed to the Ottoman Porte.

in the Topkapı, which houses 100,000 documents or more.[4] The actual corpus of Crimean writings to Istanbul must have numbered in the thousands.[5] Haphazard physical preservation of the material, as well as bureaucratic decisions to discard many documents no longer in circulation, undoubtedly resulted in decay or loss. At this juncture, however, when the task of opening the Ottoman archives for East European history has just commenced, it would be premature to estimate the extent of the surviving Crimean-related material, since an undetermined amount of material has been transferred to the Archive of the Turkish Prime Ministry in Istanbul (*Başbakanlık Arşivi*) and other repositories. As for the Topkapı collection, we cannot even be sure whether or not the documents of Crimean provenance were part of a so-called "sultan's archive" or whether they had formed a part of the records of various other bureaus (such as that of the imperial divan) and merely ended up in the current Topkapı archive.[6] In any event, the Crimean-related materials in the Topkapı cover various periods of the Khanate's history unevenly, both in number of documents and in the quality of information provided.

While individual documents reveal some important data, the collection as a whole and especially the documents that are here published for the first time do not substantially change our understanding of Crimean Tatar history. Rather they tend to underline the findings of more recent historians (for example, the great degree of autonomy and, at times, even virtual independence of the khanate vis-à-vis the Porte until the second half of the seventeenth century). But because of the vast amount of material pertaining to the Crimea found in the *Mühimme* (see fn. 5) and in other Ottoman archival sources, the collection's editors have wisely chosen to begin their source

[4] The Topkapı archive has two main divisions, one containing *defters* (bound registers) and the other containing *evrāq* (plural of *varaqa,* meaning "sheet, document") — code numbers of documents from the latter division are prefixed by "E." However, each individual *varaqa* need not have a separate "E-number," since such numbers often refer to a dossier of as many as a dozen documents.

[5] Evidence for this is the existence of abundant material relating to the Crimean Khanate in the *Mühimme defterleri* (registers of state affairs, a series of yearly draft- or copy-books of outgoing orders and decrees of the imperial divan) preserved in the Archive of the Turkish Prime Ministry in Istanbul (*Başbakanlık Arşivi*).

[6] The majority of the documents that form the Topkapı collection were stored in chests in storerooms and cellars on the palace grounds. See ʿAbd ür-Raḥmān Šeref, "Evrāq-i ʿatīqa ve vesā'iq-i tārīḫiyyemiz," *Tārīḫ-i ʿosmānī engümeni meǧmūʿasï* 1 (1328/1910): 9–19; Tahsin Öz, ed., *Topkapı Šarayı Müzesi Arşivi kılavuzu* (Istanbul, 1938); P. Wittek, "Les archives de Turquie," *Byzantion* 13 (1938): 691–699. Fekete pointed out that many of these materials were not just assorted miscellany, but rather core collections which should be catalogued as units rather than broken up according to the offices from which they originated; L. Fekete, "Über Archivalien und Archivwesen in der Türkei," *Acta Orientalia* (Budapest), 3 (1953): 179–205. Perhaps some of the Crimean material was preserved in depositories of the office of the *sïr kātibi,* or confidential secretary of the sultan (later called *mābeyn kātibi*).

publication series (*Documents concernant l'Empire ottoman et l'Europe orientale*) with the smaller and more manageable corpus of Crimean-related documents of the Topkapı.

The primary purpose of this review article is to give historians of Eastern Europe, not normally concerned with Ottoman sources, an idea of the usefulness of these documents for broadening an understanding of the history of the region during the period. I also seek to assess, and occasionally emend, the editors' commentaries. In addition I attempt to appraise the usefulness for the historian of the volume's critical apparatus.[7]

II.

Before proceeding with a survey of the historical import of the material, let me first describe the organization of *Le Khanat de Crimée*. The volume's 197 documents are presented in chronological order and are grouped according to reigns of khans. The documents range in length from 2 to 200 lines; about 70 are between 10 and 20 lines, and over 90 are longer than 20 lines. There are 54 facsimiles, of which 48 are from the group of 71 documents dated from the mid-fifteenth through the seventeenth century. A legend to each document gives the document's code number, date (often hypothetical), origin and destination, number of lines, language (Ottoman Turkish for most; some early ones are in Qïpčaq Turkic, and there is one document each in Arabic and Persian), and miscellaneous information, such as its condition. However, because the editors were working mostly from microfilms, external information, such as description of paper, ink, possible watermarks, and dimensions, are not available. Following the legend comes a rendering of the contents. According to the editors' estimation of the document's importance, either a full translation, an abridged or summary translation, or synopsis is provided. In the translations, technical terms and place-names are rendered in the original language in transliteration, occasionally with the original Arabic script. The commentaries usually identify personal names, attempt to assess the document's significance, and give references to the secondary literature as well as cross references to other documents in the volume. Here one finds a great deal of valuable research into specific events in Crimean and Ottoman, as well as Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian history. These meticulously researched commentaries contribute much to our knowledge of the history of the region. Their use is facilitated by the editors' decision to include the commentaries along with the documents rather than to relegate them to footnotes or appendices in the back of the volume. The paperbound book itself is the offset reproduction of a typewritten text.

[7] In a review article to be published in the *Journal of Turkish Studies* (Cambridge, Mass.) I will critique the philological treatment afforded to these documents and the principles of document publication followed by the volume's editors.

In addition to the excellent layout of the document section, *Le Khanat de Crimée* contains a critical apparatus that makes it a potentially very useful reference work. Included are a key to the transcription system; an introduction to the Crimean Khanate (pp. 1–29); a foldout map of the entire Black Sea and western Caspian region which incorporates many of the place-names that occur in the documents; biographies of thirty-three important khans (including two khans of Kazan) and of other important figures (pp. 315–359); a genealogical chart of the Giray dynasty; a long chronological table of khans with their respective *qalġa*s and *nūreddīn*s (first and second heirs-apparent), with a listing of the corresponding Ottoman sultans (pp. 361–370); a list of the documents in chronological order, assigning each document a date and noting the contemporary reigning khan (pp. 371–376); a list of the documents according to the archival code numbers, along with the corresponding dates (pp. 377–381); a glossary of technical terms (pp. 383–404); a selected bibliography (pp. 405–423); indexes of personal and place-names, with page references of names occurring in the actual texts of the documents being underlined (pp. 425–454).

III.

The introduction to *Le Khanat de Crimée* is an important and highly readable essay on themes and interpretations in the history of the Crimean Khanate, which is complemented by quotations from classic travel accounts and from hitherto largely unknown Venetian and other diplomatic reports. It is to be highly recommended to the broader historical community as well as to the specialist. The essay's major thrust is to debunk long-standing misconceptions about the khanate that have passed down to us through the ages: for example, the characterization of the khanate as a primitive, barbaric, plundering, slavery-based entity, or the "Ottomano-centric" depiction of it as an obedient vassal state with Ottoman institutions and ideology (actually applicable in full to the khanate only in the eighteenth century). It deals with issues such as the relations between the Girays and the Golden Horde, the problem of the suzerainty of the Ottoman Porte, the singular nature of the khanate as determined by the relations between the Giray establishment and the nomadic clan aristocracy headed by the Širin clan, and the relations of the khanate with other direct successor states of the Golden Horde (Kazan and Astrakhan), as well as with Poland-Lithuania, Muscovy, and the Ottoman Empire. Great emphasis is placed on the gradual nature of the development of the Ottoman-Crimean relationship. Set forth clearly are the dynamics of the three-way relationship between the Porte, the khan, and the Crimean aristocracy, and the conflict and compromise between the Ottoman and Činggisid political systems. The essay maintains that the khanate did not become a truly loyal vassal of the Porte until the final deposition of Meḥmed Giray IV (1666),

which is amply reflected in the documents, and illustrates the system of the Crimean clans with frequent reference to the documents.

In the discussion of the so-called "struggle for the heritage of the Golden Horde" (in which participants were the Khanate of Kazan, Astrakhan, the Crimea, and Muscovy) the concern is with two errors widespread in the historiography. The first originated in the Russian chronicle tradition and has persisted to the present day in Soviet historiography, namely, that Moscow and the Crimea were always engaged in a national and religious life-or-death struggle. In this essay, pains are taken to show that at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, the two were in fact closely allied, in pursuit of the common goal of destroying the Golden Horde centered in Saray on the Volga. The second error is the view that the Crimean Khanate was always an obedient instrument of Ottoman foreign policy, particularly in plots of anti-Russian aggression. The essay states somewhat categorically that the Ottomans were not interested in the mortal struggle between Moscow and the Crimea for control of the Volga basin, which ensued after the elimination of the Golden Horde in the early sixteenth century. When, in 1569, the Ottomans undertook to construct a Don-Volga canal and take over Astrakhan, they were supposedly interested only in attacking Safavid Iran from the rear and reviving communications with Turkestan by way of the northern littoral of the Caspian Sea. Although its reaction to Russocentric historiography is quite understandable, it is unfortunate that the essay does not come to terms with the thesis put forth by Halil Inalcik that the Ottomans were aware of and kept close watch on the Crimea's relations with Muscovy *before* the fall of Kazan and Astrakhan (1552 and 1556), and that, in fact, ever since their entry into the north Black Sea region (1475), the Ottomans played an active role in the balance-of-power politics there, to assure that no power totally dominated the region and thereby threatened their own domination of that vital area.[8] Other themes treated in the introductory essay include the continual struggle of the khanate to retain some degree of independence vis-à-vis the Porte, the international significance of the Tatar-Zaporozhian alliances in the seventeenth century, and the final Ottomanization of the khanate in the eighteenth century.

IV.

Let us now turn to an overview of the documents in *Le Khanat de Crimée*. The first period of the khanate, from the middle of the fifteenth century to the end of the reign of Khan Mengli Giray (d. 1514 or 1515), is relatively rich in documents, pertaining mostly to the three-way relations between the khan, the Crimean clan aristocracy, and the Ottoman Porte. Of the fifteenth-century documents, all but two have previously been published by Fevzi Kurtoğlu[9]

[8] Halil Inalcik, "The Origin of the Ottoman-Russian Rivalry and the Don-Volga Canal (1569)," *Annales de l'Université d'Ankara* 1 (1947): 47–110.

[9] Fevzi Kurtoğlu, "İlk Kırım hanlarının mektupları," *Belleten* 1 (1937): 641–655.

and Akdes Nimet Kurat,[10] and have been treated in the secondary literature dealing with the early Crimean Khanate.[11] Among the previously unpublished documents from the first period of the khanate is a letter from Eminek, *beg* of the Širin clan, to Sultan Meḥmed II, written in 1476, which deals with Eminek's struggle with his brother Ḥağike and with Khan Aḥmed of the Golden Horde (E 3179, pp. 59–64). There is also a 50-line draft for a *fetḥ-nāme* celebrating the conquest of Kaffa (Kefe), written in Persian, which the commentary suggests has some paleographic importance (E 11687, pp. 44–55). There are a number of mostly new documents from ca. 1510–1512 concerning the attempt by *šehzāde* (sultan's son) Selīm[12] (then governor of Kaffa) to seize the Ottoman throne. Also included is an undated letter from Mengli Giray to *šehzāde* Süleymān, interesting because in it Mengli Giray addresses the future Ottoman sultan as "my son" (*oğlum ḥaẓret-i Süleymān šāh kāmbīn*). There exists another Topkapı document concerning *šehzāde* Selīm's seditious activities — a report to Sultan Bāyezīd II bearing Mengli Giray's signature — which is not included or mentioned in our volume. According to Selâhattin Tansel,[13] who published a facsimile, its number is E 6382. It is not the same document as the E 6382 in our volume, but both documents belong to the same dossier (see fn. 4).

In the volume under review, E 6382 is a letter from Mengli Giray to Bāyezīd II (pp. 101–103) reporting on two northern raids undertaken by the Tatars. The relevant passage reads as follows:

> previously all the Crimean armies, always glorious in victory, which are only in imperial service, mounted their horses and have been on march in the wilderness and steppe from the beginnings of winter. They were divided into two detachments — one detachment made a raid against the *Rūs* infidel but was routed and their horses and they themselves were in total debility [and so] they returned, having given back to the *Rūs* infidel all of the captives that had been taken and having concluded a full peace. The other detachment has gone against the Muscovite (*Mosqov*) infidel and as yet there is no news from them.

In the translation of this document, *Rūs kāfiri* (*Rūs* infidel) is first rendered as "territoire russe" and then simply as "Russes," without any explanation of the term *russe*. The commentary suggests that the document should be dated

[10] Akdes Nimet Kurat, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivindeki Altın Ordu, Kırım ve Türkistan hanlarına ait yarlık ve bitikler*, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınlarından Tarih Serisi, 1 (Istanbul, 1940).
[11] See, e.g., Halil Inalcik, "Yeni vesiklara göre Kırım hanlığının Osmanlı tabiliğine girmesi ve ahidname meselesi," *Belleten* 8 (1944): 185–229.
[12] E 6691/2 (pp. 88–89), E 7159 (pp. 89–91, 93), E 6691/3 (pp. 92, 93–95), E 1308(1301)/1 (pp. 95–97), E 7084 (pp. 97, 99), E 11678 (pp. 98, 99). All except E 6691/2 and E 7084 have facsimiles. However, the facsimile to E 7084 can be found in Selâhattin Tansel, *Yavuz Sultan Selim* (Ankara, 1969), pl. 7. As the editors point out, E 6691/3 was previously published in Kurtoğlu, "Mektupları."
[13] Selâhattin Tansel, *Sultan II. Bâyezit'in siyasî hayatı* (Istanbul, 1966), pp. 272 ff. and pl. 28.

summer 1512 and must refer to a raid on Muscovy in which one detachment raided the region of Riazan' while another detachment went against the town of Riazan' itself. However, it is well known that until the eighteenth century the Tatars, as well as the Ottomans, denoted by the word *Rūs* the population of the southern territories of the former Galician-Volhynian Rus' state, i.e., the Ukraine and sometimes also the lands of the Don river, while they used the word *Mosqov* to denote Muscovites or Russians.[14] That *Rūs* is not a synonym for *Mosqov* is obvious in the document itself, in which there is the oppositional juxtaposition, "bir bölügi Rūs kāfirine . . . ve bir bölügi Mosqov kāfirine. . . [one detachment against the *Rūs* infidel . . . and one detachment against the *Mosqov* infidel . . .]." The editors overlook the fact that in April of the very same year to which they date this document there was a large and well-attested Tatar raid upon Galicia that was defeated by Crown and Grand Ducal forces at Vyšnyvec'. Polish sources specify that upon the defeat of the Tatar army, all the captives were taken back and many horses were seized as well. Immediately after this setback Mengli Giray dispatched a new expedition, this time against Muscovy.[15] These facts are indeed implied in E 6382.

Among the volume's documents from the same period is a remarkable Ottoman map depicting several rivers, along the largest of which are several

[14] See Omeljan Pritsak, "Das erste türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648)," *Oriens* 6 (1953): 266–298, especially 292–298 (appendix 2, "Excursus on Turkish designations for the Ukraine and Ukrainians"). However, in the seventeenth century, Crimean letters to the tsar call him, for example, "padishah of all the *Ūrūs*" or "of all the *Ūrūs* and *Pūrūs*" (to paraphrase, "the Rus' and Prussians"); V. V. Vel'jaminov-Zernov [and Ḥ. Feyẓḫanoġlï (X. Fejzxanov)], *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire du Khanat de Crimée* (St. Petersburg, 1864), pp. 48, 123, and passim. The same *laqab* (cognomen) is applied to Polish kings in Crimean letters (to whom it was probably applied first). For instance, in a letter from Ǧanibeg Giray (1628–1635) to Sigismund Vasa it is written *Uluġ Ūrūsniñ ve Pūrūsniñ . . . uluġ pādišāhi,* 'the great padishah of the great *Ūrūs* and *Pūrūs,*' and in a letter from Selīm Giray II (1682–1699, 3rd reign) to Jan III Sobieski, *Ūrūs ve Pūrūs ve Leh grāli,* 'king of the *Ūrūs* and *Pūrūs* and *Leh* [Poles] . . .'; Vel'jaminov-Zernov, *Matériaux,* pp. 26, 768–769, and passim. Fekete maintains that the form *Ūrūs* is derived from the Hungarian *orosz*; L. Fekete, *Die Siyāqat-Schrift in der Türkischen Finanzverwaltung,* 1 (Budapest, 1955), p. 58. However, a Hungarian rendering of *Rus'* need not begin with a vowel, since Hungarian has an initial *r*. More likely is that the Hungarian *orosz* is derived from a Turkic rendition of *Rus',* since Turkic has no initial *r*. Cf. the passage in *Ta'rīḫ-i Mas'ūdī,* written in Persian in the eleventh century, where *Ūrūs* occurs, presumably as a loanword from Turkic: Omeljan Pritsak, *The Origins of Rus',* vol. 1: *Old Scandinavian Sources other than the Sagas* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), p. 449. In any case, in the documents in our volume, *Mosqov* and *Mosqovlu* are the designations for Russians even in the eighteenth-century texts for which facsimiles are provided: cf. E 4910 (p. 242); E 12256/2 (p. 256); E 12256/3 (p. 259).

[15] Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy,* vol. 7 (Kiev, 1909), p. 25; Stanisław Herbst, "Najazd tatarski 1512 r.," *Przegląd Historyczny* 37 (1948): 218–226, especially 225.

fortresses (E 12090, pp. 79–80, and foldout). The editors agree with Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, who has argued that it is a map of the Ukraine from the end of the fifteenth or beginning of the sixteenth century (1495–1504 or 1506), that the main river is the Özi or Dnieper, and that the fortresses are those of Čerkez Kermān or Čerkasy, Min Kermān or Kiev, Özi or Očakiv, and Oster.[16] The map also depicts several galleys and smaller boats sailing up the Dnieper past Očakiv toward Čerkasy. The map's inscription indicates that this was a blueprint for an Ottoman expedition to destroy the Dnieper rapids with explosives and thereby allow their large ships to navigate up the Dnieper and capture Kiev.[17] In my opinion, however, some difficulties still remain in dating this map. Abrahamowicz's main reason for dating it before 1504 or 1506 was that these are the dates for the construction and first mention in the sources, respectively, of Islām Kermān, which is not depicted on the map.[18] However, since the map presumably also depicts the Dniester, with Braclav and Lviv noted as large villages but without any indication of Kaniv on the Dnieper or Aqkermān at the mouth of the Dniester, the map must be regarded as a none-too-accurate representation of the region. The depiction of Čerkasy as one of the most strongly fortified points on the map deserves scrutiny. Although it existed already in the fifteenth century, the fortress was refortified at the beginning of the sixteenth century and then in 1549 a new, stronger fortress was constructed. A description of the new fortress mentions a building with a large room and storehouse that was situated next to the wall.[19] This may indeed be the towered building next to the wall depicted in the map. Again, however, one must take care not to take the details depicted on the map too literally.

On the reigns of Meḥmed Giray (1514 or 1515–1523), Sa'ādet Giray (1524–1532), and Ṣāḥib Giray (1532–1551), there is a handful of documents, providing information on the intermittent struggles between the tribal aristocracy and the khan and on the relations of each of these parties with the Porte. E 6474 (pp. 106–110; undated, ca. 1523) is an unsigned letter whose author, according to Inalcik, may have been Baḫtiyār, *beg* of the Širins; it contains some important genealogical data on the Širin clan that contradicts information given by Muscovite sources (see below, p. 000). E 1308(1301)/2 (pp. 110–117) is an undated report (ca. 1521) from Khan Meḥmed Giray I to Sultan Süleymān, discussing problems in Crimean relations with Poland and

[16] Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, "Staraja tureckaja karta Ukrainy s planom vzryva dneprovskix porogov i ataku tureckogo flota na Kiev," in *Vostočnye istočniki po istorii Jugo-Vostočnoj i Central'noj Evropy,* ed. A. S. Tveritinova (Moscow, 1969), pp. 76–97.

[17] See the foldout map between pp. 79 and 80 of the *Le Khanat de Crimée,* and Abrahamowicz, "Karta Ukrainy," pp. 84, 87.

[18] Abrahamowicz, "Karta Ukrainy," pp. 84–86.

[19] *Istorija mist i sil Ukrajins'koji RSR,* vol. 18: *Čerkas'ka oblast'* (Kiev, 1972), pp. 88–89.

Muscovy and the Khanate of Kazan's difficulties with the latter. The khan also discusses an interesting development outside the Crimea, to which I believe the editors have given a somewhat forced interpretation. The text reads as follows:

> and to the locality where the Noġay tribe, whom we had previously taken, resides, a numerous group known as *qazaq*s has migrated and settled together with their khan and they continually spy on these parts. If it becomes possible to march in the direction of the king [of Poland], then they will combine with our old enemy, the khan of Astrakhan, and come and lay waste to the land. . . .

The commentary claims that *qazaq* is a reference to the Don Cossacks and that therefore this is one of the earliest mentions of them. However, such an interpretation presents some problems. Khan Meḥmed Giray says that this group has a khan. Were this document from the seventeenth century, when Činggisid traditions were already well on the wane, such an appellation for a leader of a non-Turkic and non-Muslim group would be possible;[20] for instance, in seventeenth-century letters from Crimean khans and notables to Moscow the tsar is called "imperial khan and great *beg*."[21] However, this particular document is from 1521, a time when Činggisid traditions were still a vital part of the political life of the region. In this period it would be very surprising for a Činggisid such as Khan Meḥmed Giray I to apply to a non-Turkic, non-Muslim, and above all non-Činggisid leader the charismatic imperial title of "khan." To argue that Slavic Cossacks were the referent would require another clear-cut example of a leader of a Christian and non-Turkic group being called khan by another Činggisid. As is well known, *qazaq* was commonly a designation for individuals or groups who were outside the legitimate (i.e., Činggisid) authority, in this context, that of the Crimean khan. Dissatisfied elements — often members of the tribal aristocracy or even Činggisid rivals of the Crimean khan — would leave the latter's domain and go out into the steppe with their followers to make their fortune (an action called *qazaq čïqmaq*). The region of the Lower Don was an age-old refuge for such *qazaq*s from the Crimea and the Caucasus region, and for some from the northern countries. Most likely Meḥmed Giray was referring to such Tatar *qazaq*s, although some Slavic elements could well have been among them, as well. What is almost certain is that their leader, i.e., their khan, was a Tatar, perhaps even a Činggisid, and that this group of *qazaq*s was not the Don Cossacks as we know them.

[20] I do not mean to say that being Turkic or Muslim was a prerequisite for Činggisid claims or for the use of the title khan. The originators of the Činggisid traditions, namely the Mongols, were not Turks and often not Muslims. But by the sixteenth century anyone with such claims would also in all likelihood be both a Turk and a Muslim (in the seventeenth century the Kalmyks were, of course, an exception).

[21] "Köp ḫïristiyānniñ pādišāhï ḫan hem ulu beg Mihayla Fidorovič," literally "padishah of many Christians and khan and great beg Mixail Fëdorovič." Vel'jaminov-Zernov, *Matériaux,* p. 34 and passim.

Among the documents from the time of Ṣāḥib Giray I are two important letters to the Ottoman sultan dealing with the dynastic strife and resulting civil war in the Crimea during the beginning of Ṣāḥib Giray's reign (1532–1551): E 1308, 1301/3 (pp. 121–123, 125) by an unidentified Crimean notable, and E 2365 (pp. 127–129) by *qalġa* Islām Giray, rival of Ṣāḥib Giray. The first writing is particularly interesting for its author's skillful combination of Činggisid, Ottoman, and Islamic ideological motifs in explaining the causes for the contemporaneous Crimean time of troubles. Unfortunately, lack of space precludes a detailed analysis of the relevant text here. Another noteworthy document from Ṣāḥib Giray's reign is E 7246 (pp. 131–133), a summary copy of a decree sent to the khan by the Porte concerning an unidentified Cossack attack on Azov (Azak).

From the reign of Devlet Giray I (1551–1557), there are only two documents: E 2082 (pp. 138–141), a *nāme-i hümāyūn* (imperial letter) from Sultan Selīm II bidding the khan to provide safe passage through Crimean-held lands to one of his royal merchants, a certain Christian named Mīḫāl, who was on his way to Moscow to acquire luxury furs for the Porte; and E 1247 (pp. 134–138), a report from Qāsïm Pasha, *beylerbeyi* (governor) of Kaffa during the 1569 Ottoman expedition to take Astrakhan, which he commanded.[22] The latter contains interesting details concerning Ottoman strategy and planned cooperation with the khan's forces.[23] After the documents from Devlet Giray's reign, the editors present two apparently minor sixteenth-century documents which cannot be definitely placed in any khan's reign. So, whereas for the first period of the khanate (up to 1515) there are 25 documents, for the rest of the sixteenth century there are only sixteen.

Similarly *Le Khanat de Crimée* contains few documents dealing with the first half of the seventeenth century. There are no documents for 1617–1628, the time of the tumultuous careers of Meḥmed Giray III (1610, 1623–1624 and 1624–1628) and his brother and *qalġa,* Šāhīn Giray, whose alliances with the Zaporozhian Cossacks altered the political contours of the region. There is an undated letter to the grand vizier from Ḫantemir (Kantemir) (E 1096, pp. 149–155), chief of the Little Noġays, denouncing the khan for allying with the Cossacks (Zaporozhians) against him and, allegedly, against the Porte as well; the editors suggest several possible datings for it, the most probable being, in their view, sometime during the reign of ʿInāyet Giray (1635–1637).

[22] It should be noted that, as regards the Crimea, the *Mühimme defterleri* are very rich for Devlet Giray's reign.

[23] As the editors note, it was previously published in Tayyib Gökbilgin, "L'expédition ottomane contre Astrakhan en 1569," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 11 (1970): 118–123. However, the editors should also have pointed out that E 1247 as well as the above-mentioned E 1308(1301)/3 and E 2365 have been previously published in facsimiles and in modernized Turkish transcription in Özalp Gökbilgin, *1532–1577 yılları arasında Kırım Hanlığı'nın siyasî durumu* (Ankara, 1973).

From the reign of Bahadïr Giray I (1637–1641) there is a series of reports to the Porte from Piyāle Pasha, a *kethüdā* (a kind of deputy or steward) of the admiralty dealing primarily with Cossack affairs (pp. 156–163). These documents give some particulars about the daily life of Cossack banditry on the steppe and sea and about an Ottoman commander's measures to patrol the region with his land and sea forces. These and later documents show the importance of reconnaissance and of intelligence gained from captured informants (*dil*)[24] in protecting the Turkish domains from the Slavic interlopers.

For the reign of Islām Giray III (1644–1654) the volume is relatively rich in data: there are 21 documents from 1645–1654, most of which deal with Ukrainian-Crimean relations during the Xmel'nyc'kyj period. E 5978 (pp. 167–168), dated 22 Reğeb 1055/14 September 1645, is from a certain Meḥmed (the editors suppose that he could be the grand vizier Sulṭānzāde Meḥmed) to an unnamed *sanğaq beyi* in the region (Aqkermān, Bender?). The editors note that the text is badly damaged and so only two marginal annotations have been translated (22 and 9 lines, respectively). The addressee is warned about an imminent Cossack naval expedition that supposedly has been ordered by the Polish king and the Cossack hetman,[25] and he is ordered to make preparations for defense and to give early warning to the Tatars of Buğaq and the Crimea. However, the addressee is cautioned not to undertake any premature counter-expeditions against the Cossacks before the *šayqa*s[26] have actually attacked. The commentary tells us that when in 1645 the Ottomans went to war against the Venetians, Władysław IV, king of Poland-Lithuania (1632–1648), refused to get involved in the conflict despite Venetian urgings, but did prudently raise the Cossack register to 20,000 men. The editors suggest that the Ottomans may have interpreted this "preemptive" mobilization as a preparation for a Cossack naval expedition against them. In fact, Władysław's greatest ambition was to bring about a grand anti-Turk crusade, but he was thwarted by the *szlachta,* which was loath to provide the

[24] *Dil* is, of course, used in the same way in Turkish as *jazyk* is in the East Slavic languages. In both cases, the primary meaning is "tongue" and also "language," but the term can be used to denote a prisoner captured to provide intelligence about the enemy. For lack of a better term in English, I translate *dil* as "informant."

[25] The editors should have pointed out that between the suppression of the Pavljuk rebellion (1638) and the Zboriv pact (1649), the Zaporozhian Cossacks were deprived of the right to have their own hetman. During this period the highest-ranking Zaporozhian was the *staršyj,* while the former top position of Cossack hetman was held by the Crown hetman. What is translated as "*hetman* des Cosaques" in E 5978 and "*hetman* en chef" ("*bâš hetman*" in the original, according to the editors) in the next document, E 11489 (pp. 169, 171, no facsimile), could refer either to the Polish Crown hetman or Ukrainian *staršyj,* since these two documents both date from before 1649.

[26] *Šayqa*, the Ukrainian equivalent of which is *čajka,* refers to the maneuverable boats used by the Cossacks.

king with a sizable army for fear of augmenting royal power. After the Diet forced him to disband the armies that he had gathered for a Turkish war, Władysław met secretly in April 1646 with three Cossack leaders (including Xmel'nyc'kyj) and supposedly gave them a charter allowing them to muster Cossacks, now his last hope for the realization of his crusading plans.[27] However, no such document has ever been found, and there were many conflicting rumors about the number to which the register could be raised — 20,000 men is only one frequently cited figure. In any event, the plan was never put into effect and there is no evidence that any mustering of Cossacks took place at the time. Furthermore, the plans for the presumed 20,000 register that the editors refer to took place in 1646, so E 5978 cannot possibly be a report in response to it.

E 4391/1 (pp. 170, 171, 173) is an undated report from the *sanǧaq beyi* of Qïl Burun (Kinburn, on the mouth of the Dnieper, opposite Özi). Although the editors call it a copy, it is obviously an original, since the document has a full protocol and a signature. The editors date it to the end of 1647 or the beginning of 1648. The report tells about a Tatar expedition near the shores of the Dnieper aimed at capturing informants (*dils*) on recent Cossack activity in the region. The mission is successful: from the captured Cossack informants the information is extracted that 120 Cossacks led by a certain "Qanča" have themselves set out in search of Tatar informants in the vicinity of Özi. Furthermore, the Cossack captives report that the Don Cossacks (*Mosqov qazaqlarï*) are planning an incursion and that a Polish army or more than 20,000 men is ready to come to the aid of the Muscovites. A detachment headed by a certain "Tiškovski" is ready to march. But at this time that detachment has no intention to raid the Black Sea because Poland is at peace with the Ottomans. The Cossacks only intend to capture some informants. If Qanča is not successful, the *polkovnyk* (*pūqūlnīq*), "a chief of 1,000 Cossacks," is ready to depart on an expedition for the same purpose. Thus goes the report of the captured Cossacks. The editors cannot identify Qanča and Tiškovski. Most likely, Qanča is a Turkish rendering of the Polish "Gandza" or the Ukrainian "Handža," the name of a Cossack *polkovnyk*[28] who went

[27] V. A. Golobuckij, *Zaporožskoe kazačestvo* (Kiev, 1957), pp. 252–256.

[28] Probably not the same Handža, *polkovnyk* of the Uman' regiment, who is famous for being the leader of peasant rebels and who often cooperated with Kryvonis and with Hira of Bila Cerkva. See [Jakub Michałowski], *Jakuba Michałowskiego wojskiego lubelskiego a późniéj kasztelana bieckiego księga pamiętnicza z dawnego rękopisma będącego własnością Ludwika Hr. Morsztyna,* ed. Antoni Zygmunt Helcel (Cracow, 1864), pp. 95, 148, and Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy,* vol. 8, pt. 3 (Kiev, 1922), pp. 38–40, 49, 52, 72. Cf. references in fn. 220. Also see Xmel'nyc'kyj's grievances, as reported by Koniecpolski's envoys, about the granting of various *sloboda*s or settlements with state taxation moratorium to, among others, Handža (whom I consider to be the same Handža named in E 4391/1 who served the Poles and not the *polkovnyk* of

over to the Polish side in 1649 and was eventually ennobled and who is singled out in Polish sources for his exemplary service to the Commonwealth.[29] The Qanča sent to capture informants is undoubtedly this same Gandza-Handža, who made a career of such activity; for example, during the operations around Berestečko in 1651, Polish relations report his informant-capturing activity before the famous battle.[30] As for Tiškovski, he could be the noble cavalryman (*towarzysz*) Tyszkowski in Jeremi Wiśniowiecki's retinue.[31] This supposition is supported by the fact that in October 1647 Wiśniowiecki unexpectedly undertook an expedition deep into Tatar country, as far as Perekop. This controversial and mysterious action by Wiśniowiecki has been variously interpreted by historians, namely, as a reconnaissance mission into the steppes in search of new territory for colonization, as a retaliatory action against the Tatars carried out without the knowledge of the central government, or, as W. Tomkiewicz maintains, as an attempt to provoke a Tatar (and eventually Ottoman) military reaction. This was supposedly done by Wiśniowiecki, an opponent of Władysław's Turkish war plans, as part of a secret concession to the war party. While Wiśniowiecki's forces went in the direction of Moločni vody and Perekop, the standardbearer (*chorąży*) Alexander Koniecpolski went as far as Očakiv or Özi (on the last day of October) and indeed captured several dozen informants.[32] So it is quite possible that E 4391/1 is an Ottoman view of this enigmatic event on the eve of the Xmel'nyc'kyj revolt.

Another point about E 4391/1: the commentary gives 2 December 1647 (o.s.) as the date of the signing in Moscow of an accord between the Commonwealth and Muscovy aimed at cooperation against the Crimea. But in fact this is merely the date of the reaffirmation of the accord by the Lithuanian delegation which arrived late and with whom the Muscovites refused to negotiate, since an agreement negotiated with Adam Kysil had already been reached. The correct date of signing is 15 (25) September 1647.[33] Since

---

the Uman' regiment). Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy,* vol. 9, pt. 1 (Kiev, 1928), p. 63.

[29] Michałowski, *Księga pamiętnicza,* pp. 507, 520, 521; A. Z. Baraboj et al., comps., and P. P. Gudzenko et al., eds., *Dokumenty ob osvoboditel'noj vojne ukrainskogo naroda, 1648–1654* (Kiev, 1965), p. 478.

[30] Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija,* 9, pt. 1: 277, 278. E.g., in a letter from the Polish camp at Sokal' dated 29 May 1651 "today's *jazyk*s were obtained by Janžul, a Zaporozhian Cossack, . . . accompanying him was Handža. Here we understand the usefulness of the Zaporozhian Cossacks: when ours go out in search of informants they cannot capture anything, but Zabuz'kyj, Janzul, Handža — these never go in vain." Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija,* 9, pt. 1: 272–273, fn. 4.

[31] Władysław Tomkiewicz, *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki (1612–1651)* (Warsaw, 1933), pp. 98–99.

[32] Tomkiewicz, *Wiśniowiecki,* pp. 178–179.

[33] A. A. Novosel'skij, *Bor'ba Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Tatarami v pervoj polovine XVII veka* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1948), p. 366, fn. 3. For a discussion of the terms of the accord, with references to a publication of the treaty as well as

E 4391/1 refers to an alliance between the Poles and Muscovites, the editors lean toward dating it to the end of 1647 or even beginning of 1648. Considering that the accord was reached in September and not December, the report could in fact have been issued several months earlier.

Among the most interesting of the documents dealing with the period of Islām Giray and Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj are E 3005/2 (pp. 176, 177–178), E 3005/4 (pp. 178–181), and E 2237 (pp. 181–183). All three are undated and addressed to the Porte, with the first two being obviously from Islām Giray and the third being presumably from the *beylerbeyi* of Kaffa (Kefe) if not from the khan himself. The first and third documents have to do with plans, urged by the Crimeans, for a joint Zaporozhian-Tatar expedition against the Don Cossacks, with the aim of putting an end to the depredations of the latter in the Black Sea and around the Crimea, which then jeopardized the security of the Zaporozhian-Crimean alliance. The second document describes a military encounter in which the Tatar-Zaporozhian forces are seemingly victorious over the Poles. In *Le Khanat de Crimée* and elsewhere[34] these documents have been interpreted, respectively, as describing events before, during, and after the Cossack-Tatar victory at Zboriv on 15–16 August 1649. Indeed, the first and third documents, which are concerned with a projected anti-Don campaign, could refer to 1649, although the Crimeans pushed for such a campaign with their Zaporozhian allies in other years as well, e.g., 1650, 1651, and 1652.[35] The crucial document, however, is the second, E 3005/4. After describing the battle, Islām Giray makes a statement which leaves no doubt that the letter was written no earlier than late summer 1651: he announces to the grand vizier the death of his *qalġa,* Qrïm Giray. There is considerable evidence in the Slavic and Turkic sources that Qrïm Giray lived past Zboriv and 1649, and that he survived even after the battle of Berestečko of 28–30 June 1651. Without going into all of the evidence here, I point to letters from Qrïm Giray as *qalġa* dated as late as 1 Ramaẓān 1061/18 August 1651.[36] Clearly, then, Islām Giray is referring not to the battle of Zboriv and the events of 1649, but rather to the events of mid-1651. In a separate article, I plan to show, on the basis of evidence external and internal to this document, why Islām Giray could have portrayed the events of the summer of 1651, which is known as a time of Cossack-Tatar setbacks, as a time of favorable and even victorious military encounters.

---

manuscripts of it in the USSR and Poland, see Frank E. Sysyn, "Adam Kysil, Statesman of Poland-Lithuania: A Study of the Commonwealth's Rule of the Ukraine from 1600 to 1653" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1976), pp. 225–226 and 479, fn. 192.

34 Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, "Three Ottoman Documents Concerning Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1 (1977): 347–358.

35 Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy,* 8, pt. 3: 172, 240, 248–249, 251; idem, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy,* 9, pt. 1: 53 ff., 133, 134, 468.

36 Vel'jaminov-Zernov, *Matériaux,* pp. 446–447 and passim.

Of particular significance for the history of the Xmel'nyc'kyj period is E 8548 (pp. 191–196), an Ottoman copy of a letter to the Porte from Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj written in Čyhyryn in 1653. While Xmel'nyc'kyj maintained a correspondence with the Ottomans throughout his struggle with Poland, this document is the only known Ottoman translation of one of his letters, although no doubt many others remain in the Ottoman archives. E 8548 was first published by Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, and the translation given in *Le Khanat de Crimée* is a reprint, with minor changes, of her translation published in 1970.[37] Since the Ottoman text of this important document has never been published, it is to be regretted that the editors did not include a facsimile in the volume under review.[38] Without Xmel'nyc'kyj's original letter, it is difficult to judge the quality of the Ottoman translation. The language is a relatively straightforward, rather than high-style, literary Ottoman. This, along with the lack of any striking divergence from the diplomatics of Xmel'nyc'kyj's writings, suggests that the translation is a relatively faithful rendition of the original. The letter's main points are as follows: (1) the arrival of a certain Rïḍvān Aġa with a letter from the grand vizier is acknowledged; (2) the approach of the enemy (the Polish army) is announced and aid is requested in the form of a dispatch of troops with the governor of Silistre and an order to the Crimean khan to come to the support of the Cossacks — in return the hetman promises to render eternal obedience to the Porte and commit all of his forces for any of the Porte's military undertakings; (3) the reinstatement of Ramaẓān Bey, a friend and supporter of the Zaporozhians, as *sanǧaq beyi* of Qïl Burun is requested; (4) gratitude is expressed for the freeing of a certain Vasyl', who had been seized on his way to Özi to deliver a letter, and a request is made that two other unjustly enslaved Cossacks be freed; (5) reaffirmation of loyal service to the padishah is made; (6) it is requested that an order from the sultan be sent to Qïl Burun, Özi, Aqkermān, and Bender forbidding the taking of Cossack captives in the Ukrainian lands.

The commentary to E 8548 gives a brief overview of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Porte vis-à-vis his relations with Moscow. Relying on N. Kostomarov's article "Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, tributary of the Ottoman Porte"[39] for references to other pieces in the correspondence between Xmel'nyc'kyj and the Porte, the commentary portrays the Cossack hetman as a shrewd

[37] Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, "Les relations entre la Porte ottomane et les Cosaques zaporogues au milieu du XVII^e siècle: Une lettre inédite de Bohdan Hmelnicki au Padichah ottoman," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 11 (1970): 454–461.

[38] I would like to thank Dr. Mihnea Berindei for providing me with a reproduction of the Ottoman text which served as a basis for my comments. I plan to publish a facsimile of E 8548 in a forthcoming issue of this journal.

[39] N. I. Kostomarov, "Bogdan Xmel'nickij, dannik Ottomanskoj Porty," *Vestnik Evropy* (St. Petersburg), 13 (December 1878): 806–817.

blackmailer of the two powers, obtaining vassal status from one and then using it to pressure the other into granting him its protection. It is, in my opinion, correct to follow Kostomarov in tracing Xmel'nyc'kyj's repeated pledges of submission to the Porte even past the Treaty of Perejaslav (1654). However, the commentary relies too much on Kostomarov's article, first published over one hundred years ago, which Hruševs'kyj has called "more of a political pamphlet than a historical study."[40] Thus, the editors maintain that the correspondence began in February 1649, and make no mention of Omeljan Pritsak's contention that direct relations between Xmel'nyc'kyj and the Porte were already underway in June–August 1648.[41] Following Kostomarov, a wrong Christian date — December 1650 — is given for the letter from the Porte dated Rebīʿ I 1061. The correct date is 22 February–23 March 1651. The editors seem unaware that the latter letter was published in a deluxe facsimile edition by Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall.[42] The commentary is also mistaken about the date for Xmel'nyc'kyj's letter to the grand vizier, in which the hetman offers 40,000 Zaporozhians to the service of the Porte. The editors, citing Hammer's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches,* which summarizes the Ottoman chronicler Naʿīmā, give the date as December 1651. In fact, both Hammer and Naʿīmā give December 1652 as the date of the letter.[43]

The commentary somewhat complacently accepts a tendentious and polemical commonplace in Soviet historiography — namely, "vossoedinenie," the so-called reunification of the Ukraine with Russia — by stating that after the treaty of Žvanec' (December 1653) "the traditional alliances renewed them-

[40] Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, "Z pryvodu lystuvannja B. Xmel'nyc'koho z Otoman-s'koju Portoju," *Ukrajina,* 1930, no. 42 (June–August), pp. 3–7, especially p. 5.
[41] Pritsak, "Bündnis (1648)."
[42] Kostomarov got December 1650 from a Polish translation of the original Ottoman text made in 1789 by Antonius Crutta, chief dragoman of eastern languages to the Polish Crown. Hammer repeated Crutta's mistake when he published a giant-sized facsimile of this document (in original dimensions: 70 × 130 cm), along with Crutta's Polish translation, and his own French translation, as a supplement in a Kiev archeographic series: "Gramota Sultana Tureckogo Moxammeda IV, Bogdanu Xmel'nickomu i vsem vojsku Zaporožskomu. V dekabre 1650," in *Pamjatniki izdannye Vremennoju Kommisieju dlja razroba drevnix aktov* 3 (1852): 436–440. Hammer's deluxe publication seems to have been destined for oblivion. It was overlooked by Kostomarov, Smirnov (who told his readers that the facsimile alone was sent to him by a friend in the Crimea, but that he did not have the faintest idea where and by whom it was published: "gde to i kem to nalitografirovan fac-simile. Po vsej verojatnosti, on izdan v Vene, sudja po tščatel'nosti i izjaščestvu litografskoj raboty . . . ," Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo,* p. 550, fn. 2), Babinger, and Rypka, among others, and seemingly forgotten until Hruševs'kyj. Having already pointed out the mistaken date in 1928 (Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija,* 9, pt. 1: 136, fn. 1) he brought it to the attention of orientalists in his 1930 article "Z pryvodu." Now it seems to have been forgotten once again.
[43] Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches,* vol. 5 (Pest, 1829), p. 579.

selves: from one side Poland the khanate and Ottoman Empire, from the other side Muscovy and the Zaporozhians."[44] But the greatest failing in the commentary to Xmel'nyc'kyj's letter is that twentieth-century contributions to the problem of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Ottomans are not taken into account. Since Hammer, Kostomarov, and Smirnov, there have been other important contributions to precisely this problem, not the least of which is the series of articles by the Czech orientalist, Jan Rypka, on copies of Ottoman letters to Xmel'nyc'kyj found in the so-called Göttingen Codex.[45] In these articles, Rypka provided facsimiles, Arabic-script texts, translations, and analyses of a total of seven Ottoman documents relating to Xmel'nyc'kyj.

A consideration of the Ottoman documents treated by Rypka would have added much to our picture of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Porte. It so happens that a document in Rypka's third article on this subject has a direct bearing on E 8548.[46] The document in question is a copy of a letter from the grand vizier to the hetman which, it states, accompanied the return of "accidentally" enslaved Cossack envoys. There can be little doubt that this letter, which stresses the inviolability of all envoys coming to or going from the Porte and whose tone is almost apologetic, is concerned with the same incident as E 8548. The relevant passage is as follows:

> . . . since [my, i.e., Grand Vizier Tarḫunǧï Aḥmed Pasha's (June 1652–March 1653)] coming to the grand vizierate there has been no lack of men coming and going from every direction to the threshold of good fortune with letters of subservience [*'ubūdiyyetnāme*]. From you, our friend, neither a letter nor a man has arrived. While waiting for news from your direction explaining the reason for this, from Ramaẓān Beg, who was previously the governor of Qïl Burun, it was heard that when men of yours were coming from your side to the gate of the center of imperial good fortune to display subservience, they were seized in the fortress of

[44] Of course, Poland and the Crimean Khanate can be viewed as "traditional allies," given their close links during the early years of the khanate's independence. But it is clearly anachronistic to view Muscovy and the Zaporozhians (or the Ukraine) as traditional allies, since, despite Prince Dmytro Vyšnevec'kyj's brief flirtation with Muscovy (late 1550s to 1561), they were never allies before the advent of the Xmel'nyc'kyj movement. In another commentary (E 12142, p. 190) it is curious what Muscovite source is being referred to in the statement: "Le 1er octobre, le *Zemskiy Sobor* de Moscou avait décidé d'accepter la *réunion* [stress added] de l'Ukraine à la Moscovie."

[45] J. Rypka, "Z korespondence Vysoké Porty s Bohdanem Chmelnickým," *Sborník věnovaný Jaroslavu Bidlovi, Profesoru Karlovy University k šedesátým narozeninám,* ed. Miloš Weingart et al. (Prague, 1928), pp. 346–350, German résumé, pp. 482–498; the first document in J. Rypka, "Weitere Beiträge zur Korrespondenz der Hohen Pforte mit Bohdan Chmel'nyckyj," *Archiv Orientální* (Prague), 2 (1930): 262–283, is a draft copy found in the Göttingen Codex of the above-mentioned letter of Sultan Meḥmed IV, dated Rebī' I 1061; J. Rypka, "Další příspěvek ke korespondenci Vysoké Porty s Bohdanem Chmelnickým," *Časopis Národního Musea* 105 (1931): 209–231. Hruševs'kyj, "Z pryvodu," is a reaction to the first Rypka article.

[46] Rypka, "Další příspěvek ke korespondenci," pp. 220–224.

Özi and sold. When news to this effect was divulged a thorough investigation and search were carried out and within one or two days men of yours named Vasyl' Jurkovan (?) and [ ] were found. And those in whose hands they were, were given their price and they were newly clothed. Together with [ ] who is from among our men, an example to [his] peers and equals, may his power increase, they were dispatched to you and sent off with this letter of friendship. . . .

The rest of the letter promises the punishment of those guilty of enslaving the Cossack envoys and the dispatch of necessary military support from either the Crimean khan or Ottoman forces in the Dobrudja, in case of attack by any of the Cossacks' enemies. It also requests the hetman's acknowledgment of the return of his missing envoys as well as a reaffirmation of his loyalty to the Porte. The date given at the end of the letter is 22 Muḥarrem [10]63/23 December 1652. On this basis it can be surmised that E 8548 was written about 30 to 50 days (the length of the journey between Istanbul and Čyhyryn) after this letter from the grand vizier was composed or dispatched. Such a date for E 8548 fits in well with what we know of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Porte in early 1653. Indeed, a new campaign was being prepared by the Poles against the Ukrainian Cossacks; already in December 1652 a mobilization of the Crown army was initiated by the king.[47] A dispatch by the Austrian resident of Istanbul dated 21 February 1653 reports that he has learned that Cossack messengers on their way to Istanbul have arrived at Silistra and that Xmel'nyc'kyj requests Ottoman and Tatar aid against a greatly strengthened Polish army.[48] And, as the editors suggest, the Ottoman chronicler Na'īmā's record of the reception of four Cossack envoys in March 1653 could very well be connected with this event.[49]

However, further comment is required concerning the dating of E 8548. While "1653, au milieu de l'hiver" is given in the translation to E 8548 in *Le Khanat de Crimée,* in fact the original gives a more specific date: *orta qïš ayïnuñ üčinde . . . 1653* "on the third day of the middle month of winter . . . 1653." While we do not know the actual designation for day and month in Xmel'nyc'kyj's original, it is likely that the Ottoman scribe transposed the Christian-calendar month-name into a solar-year equivalent that was in use by the Ottomans. Among the names for solar months used by the Ottomans were seasonal names, whereby each season was divided into a first, middle, and last part. According to an almanac of solar and lunar calendars included in a seventeenth-century Ottoman correspondence manual, the month of January was considered the "middle of winter."[50] This would imply

[47] Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija,* 9, pt. 1: 488.
[48] *Žerela do istoriji Ukrajiny-Rusy,* vol. 12, pt. 1 (Lviv, 1911), p. 192.
[49] Muṣṭafā Na'īmā, *Ravżat el-ḥüseyn fī ḫulāsāt aḫbār el-ḫāfiqayn,* vol. 5 (Istanbul, 1280/1863–64), pp. 274–275. Na'īmā does not specify the date of the arrival or reception of the Cossack envoys: his account is between other accounts, dated 15 and 19 Rebī' II 1063 [15 and 19 March 1653].
[50] "The month of Kānūn-i s̱ānī [January], that is to say *Yanāris* [January],

3 January 1653 for the date of E 8548. Such a dating is incompatible with the date given at the end of the copy of the grand vizier's letter to Xmel'nyc'kyj — 23 December 1652 — if E 8548 is indeed a response to it. It is possible, of course, that the hetman learned of the release and dispatch of his envoys before they actually arrived with the grand vizier's letter, since Xmel'nyc'kyj was in constant contact with officials in the nearby Ottoman border provinces, as well as with the Crimeans. However, it must be noted that both documents are copies and not originals and therefore one or both of the dates could very well be suspect as far as day and month are concerned.[51] While these two documents cannot be given exact dates with certainty, they doubtlessly belong to the end of 1652–beginning of 1653. Together they help to fill a lacuna in our record of Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with the Porte during the important time when the hetman, through his son Tymiš, was politically and militarily involved in Moldavia.[52] This gap has existed in part because Ottoman sources have not been readily available to historians of the Xmel'nyc'kyj period.[53] Moreover, these two documents are significant because they help to explain why there has been an apparent break in the record: the incident of the seizure of the Cossack envoys revealed by these documents suggests that the gap is not necessarily due to the attrition of the source base, but rather to an actual break in contact between Xmel'nyc'kyj and the Porte for some time between June and December 1652. As for the actual interference with Xmel'nyc'kyj's envoys, while it might have been no more than an accident, it cannot be ruled out that opponents of the Porte's pro-Xmel'nyc'kyj policy, either

---

the middle of winter [*evsaṭ-i šitā*]," Staatsbibliothek, Berlin Hs. or. oct. 917, fol. 169b. For a description of the manuscript, see Hanna Sohrweide, ed., *Türkische Handschriften und einige in den Handschriften enthaltene persische und arabische Werke,* Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, vol. 13, pt. 3 (Wiesbaden, 1974), pp. 125–126. I thank my colleague András Riedlmayer for bringing this *inšā*-manual to my attention and for providing me with a copy of the relevant part of this manuscript.

51 Thus, for example, the date of the grand vizier's letter, the copy of which is a part of the Göttingen Codex (Codex Gött. Turc. 29 fol. 101b–102a), could perhaps be the date when a copy of the original was entered into the codex.

52 Perhaps E 8548 is the letter to the Ottoman sultan from January 1653 listed by Kryp"jakevyč and Butyč in their appendix which lists unrevealed documents of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj mentioned in the sources and literature: I. Kryp"jakevyč and I. Butyč, eds., *Dokumenty Bohdana Xmel'nyc'koho, 1648–1657* (Kiev, 1961), p. 659.

53 As Rypka has pointed out, neither Hruševs'kyj nor other historians mention any Cossack missions to the Porte or Ottoman missions to the hetman from June 1652 to February 1653: Rypka, "Další příspěvek ke korespondenci," pp. 211–212. However, if Na'īmā's chronology is to be trusted, as indicated above, a Cossack mission arrived in Istanbul in December (Muḥarrem) 1652. It is possible that the grand vizier's letter to Xmel'nyc'kyj complaining of the lack of communications from the hetman was already dispatched before the arrival of this mission.

within the Crimean Khanate or within the Ottoman government, central or provincial, were responsible for a sabotage of communications between Čyhyryn and Istanbul. Indeed, these two documents might be clues to the occurrence of such interference, since earlier some opponents of Xmel'nyc'kyj, such as the hospodar of Moldavia, Vasile Lupu, who was cooperating with the Poles, had intercepted letters and envoys from the hetman on their way to Istanbul.[54]

For the rest of the seventeenth century (from the death of Islâm Giray in 1654 to the beginning of the third reign of Ḥāğī Selīm Giray in 1692), the volume has no documents. Turning to the eighteenth century (including the third reign of Selīm Giray (1692–1699), we find that the nature of the presentation changes. Although 126 documents are covered (as compared with 71 for the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries), there are only four full translations and only seven facsimiles. Here we have more of a detailed annotated catalogue than a document publication (there are 112 pages for these 126 documents, as compared to 167 pages for the first 71 documents): the text of the documents is presented only in summary form, although the commentaries remain rather extensive. Many of the documents for the first half of the eighteenth century are concerned with minor affairs, such as property claims by robbed merchants, skirmishes with Cossacks in the steppes, and denunciations of the ruling khan by disaffected Girays. However, several events are abundantly documented and are of interest to historians of the period. The first reign of Arslān Giray (1748–1755) has 22 documents, mostly concerned with incidents in the steppe involving the Zaporozhian Cossacks (cattle theft, murder of merchants, etc.). This includes more than a dozen letters, dated 1750 and early 1751, involving the governor-general of Kiev, M. I. Leont'ev, the khan, and the Porte, and concern the fate of some Cossacks who disappeared in the vicinity of Özi or Očakiv and were allegedly murdered or sold into slavery. There is an exchange of recriminations and a demand of compensation for lost property.[55] The commentary should have mentioned that 1750 was the year of a massive *hajdamak* uprising in the Right-Bank Ukrainian lands under Polish rule, in which the Zaporozhian Sich, then subject to Russia, also had a part. The unusually high level of Cossack-Tatar confrontation on the frontier that year may have been a reverberation of this bloody jacquerie, since many *hajdamak* units eventually fled to the Sich as well as into Crimean and Ottoman territory beyond it.

[54] Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija,* 9, pt. 1: 62, 132 ff.

[55] A letter in this correspondence, from Arslān Giray to Leont'ev, is preserved in the collection of the former Kiev Archaeographic Commission, now housed in the Central State Historical Archive of the Ukrainian SSR (Kiev). The same archive contains a letter dated 22 July 1745 from Khan Selīm Giray II to Leont'ev concerning border skirmishes between Zaporozhians and Noġays. See Ja. R. Daškevyč, ed., *Kataloh kolekciji dokumentiv Kyjivs'koji arxeohrafičnoji komisiji 1369–1899* (Kiev, 1971), pp. 104, 101.

The commentary points out that among the documents from the reigns of Arslān Giray and Qrïm Giray (1758–1764) are several that were known to Smirnov (apparently from copies in Russian archives) and are referred to in his history of the khanate in the eighteenth century.[56] However, the commentary makes several incorrect statements about references to the Ukrainian Cossacks occurring in these documents. While no explanation is given of "pays de Barabaš" in connection with E 737/11 (p. 231), the entry "Barabaš" in the index refers the reader to "Cosaques zaporogues." Although without a facsimile of the document we cannot be sure of the exact usage of the term there, we know that "Barabaš" was the conventional Ottoman designation for the Left-Bank Hetmanate (1663–1764).[57] In E 737/14 (p. 223) *qošavi* is first rendered correctly as "chef des Cosaques." In the résumé to E 737/15 (p. 233), however, it is first rendered as "Cosaques Qošâvï . . . , de 'Koševoy,' Zaporogues" and later in the same document it is given as "Le chef de 'Qošâvï.'" The entries "Qošavi (Koševoj)" and "Cosaques Qosavi (Kosevoj) [sic]" in the index refer the reader to "Cosaques zaporogues." The term in question derives from the Ukrainian *košovyj* (Russian *koševoj*); in general, it referred to the head of a Zaporozhian unit called "kiš" or "koš," but in the Hetmanate (1648–1775) the *košovyj otaman* was the head of the Zaporozhian Sich.[58] Presumably, the Ottoman "qošavi" has the latter meaning in these documents, unless, of course, its original meaning was corrupted to mean Zaporozhians. Again, without the original text we have no way of knowing the actual Ottoman usage of this term.

In the résumés of E 737/9 (p. 230) and E 737/11 (p. 231), both allegedly translations of letters in Russian from governor-general Leont'ev, Ottoman renditions of the names of two Zaporozhian *kurens* — "Plastunski" and "Sečrenboyski" — are cited. These Ottoman renditions correspond to the Plastunovs'kyj and Ščerbynovs'kyj *kureni* (platoons).[59] In E 3813/2 (p. 226) a place-name "Miknā" occurs which could not be identified. Since it was on the path of a Crimean envoy traveling from Baxčysaraj (Bāġčesarāy) to Kiev it probably refers to Mykytyn' located on the Mykytyn' Rih (on the Dnieper, opposite present-day Nikopol'), the location of a former sich, mentioned by Erich Lassota, and, at the time of this document, a ford and Zaporozhian outpost.[60]

56 See Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo,* pp. 76–77, 87–88, 88, for references to E 3076/1, E 3811/1 and 2, and E 3811/3, respectively.
57 Pritsak, "Bündnis (1648)," p. 295.
58 Pritsak, "Bündnis (1648)," p. 294.
59 D. I. Èvarnickij, *Istorija zaporožskix kozakov,* vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 199–200.
60 D. I. Èvarnickij, *Vol'nosti zaporožskix kozakov* (St. Petersburg, 1898), pp. 104–106; A. P. Nepokupnyj, O. S. Stryžak, K. K. Cilujko, eds., *Slovnyk hidronimiv Ukrajiny* (Kiev, 1979), p. 361.

From the short first reign of Devlet Giray III (April 1769–February 1770) and from the even shorter reign of Qaplan Giray II (February–November 1770) there are 27 and 15 documents, respectively, most of which are concerned with the Russo-Ottoman war of 1768–74. Battle accounts from May 1769 to September 1770 give a good picture of Ottoman-Crimean military coordination.[61] They also contain many Ottoman place-names from Moldavia and the Ukraine, of which few are identified in the commentaries.[62] Of particular import for those interested in this war is a nearly day-to-day correspondence covering the Xotyn siege and the Moldavian campaign from 5 August to 16 December 1769.

The rest of the document-survey for the eighteenth century includes a handful of documents relating to the reign of Šāhīn Giray (1777–1783), his relations with imperial Russia, and the elimination of the Crimean Khanate. The editors have also included seven documents from the reigns of Šāhbāz Giray (1787–1789) and Baḫt Giray (1789–1792) as Ottoman-appointed khans of the Kuban. In addition there are seven documents from the eighteenth century that were unidentifiable or undateable — among these is a list of gifts and payments presented to the khan and other Girays for their military assistance to the Ottomans (1736?), which has been translated in full.

V.

Turning now to the additional critical apparatus in the appendices, it is appropriate to stress again that besides being a document publication, *Le Khanat de Crimée* is a useful reference work on the Crimean Khanate. The section "notices biographiques" provides us with compendia of much of what is known about thirty-three important figures in the khanate's history. They include references to relevant documents in this volume as well as to chronicles, and by virtue of their detail serve as a good supplement to the introductory essay. Cited extensively in the biographical summaries is Ananiasz Zajączkowski's edition of Rïḍvānpašazāde's *Tevārīḫ-i Dešt-i Qïpčaq,* an especially valuable

[61] Note that in E 12256/3 (pp. 257–260) and E 12256/4 (p. 260) the khan tries to minimize the full extent of Ottoman losses at Xotyn (1769). In another instance, letters of the khan are accompanied by marginal notes, presumably by the grand vizier, warning the sultan to disregard the contents of the khan's letter because, according to him, the khan is trying to create confusion in favor of his own interests: E 3811/1 and 2 (pp. 236–238); E 3811/3 (pp. 238–239).

[62] E.g., in E 12255/3 (p. 261) there is a description of a Tatar retaliatory raid into the Ukraine in 1796. There is no identification of "Grande Ternovqa" and "Petite Ternovqa." These two rivers are probably the Velyka Ternivka and the Mala Ternivka, both right-bank tributaries of the Samara River: Èvarnickij, *Vol'nosti,* p. 161 and Nepokupnyj, *Slovnyk hidronimiv,* p. 560. In the same document, what the editors cite as "Kildjinqa (Kīlčinqa)" is either the Kil'čenka, a left tributary of the Oril', or the Kil'čen, a right tributary of the Samara, but in any event not a tributary of the Dnieper, as the index maintains (p. 448); Èvarnickij, *Vol'nosti,* p. 161, and Nepokupnyj, *Slovnyk hidronimiv,* p. 250.

contemporary narrative source for the early seventeenth century. Regrettably, however, a severely abridged eighteenth-century French summary of the chronicle done by a *jeune de langues* attached to the French embassy in Turkey is cited, even though Zajączkowski also gives a facsimile and critical edition of the Turkish text.

Besides important khans of the Crimea, the biographical summaries includes articles on Eminek, *beg* of the Širins, and Meḥmed Emīn, khan of Kazan. These two articles also have genealogies of the Širin *qaraču* begs and the khans of Kazan, respectively. The Širin genealogy is based mainly on the reports of Muscovite diplomats and scribes, who in dealing with the Tatars became very well informed on clan politics in the Crimea.[63] While some of the documents in this volume confirm the data of the Muscovite and other outside sources,[64] Inalcik has pointed out that at least one document of Crimean origin, E 6474 (pp. 106–110) (perhaps from Baḫtiyār, *beg* of the Širins), contradicts the information in the given genealogy. On the basis of this document and a special section on the Širin clan's genealogy in *ʿUmdet üt-Tevārīḫ* by ʿAbd ül-Ġaffār (who was himself a Širin), Inalcik has proposed a substantially different genealogy of the Širin *qaraču*s.[65] Without pretending to have resolved the contradictions in the sources, I can say only that more work needs to be done on this problem and that probably some of these differences will remain, given the limitations of the present source base.[66]

Those doing research on the Crimea and related regions will find very useful a detailed chronology of the reigns of khans (pp. 361–370), which gives their respective *qalġa*s and *nūreddīn*s (when these latter two are known). There is also a large foldout genealogy of the Giray dynasty, which includes Giray

[63] The Širin genealogy seems to be based on the following materials: G. Th. Karpov, ed., *Pamjatniki diplomatičeskix snošenij Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Krymskoju i Nagajskoju ordami i s Turciej,* vol. 1: *S 1474 po 1505 god, epoxa sverženija mongolskogo iga v Rossii,* Sbornik Imperatorskogo russkogo istoričeskogo obščestva, 41 (St. Petersburg, 1884); G. Th. Karpov and G. Th. Štendman, eds., *Pamjatniki diplomatičeskix snošenij Moskovskogo gosudarstva s Krymom, Nagajami i Turcieju,* vol. 2: *1508–1521 gg.,* Sbornik Imperatorskogo russkago istoričeskago obščestva, 95 (St. Petersburg, 1895); Kazimierz Pułaski, *Stosunki z Mendli-Girejem chanem Tatarow Perekopskich (1469–1515): Akta i listy,* Stosunki polski z Tatarszczyzną od połowy XV. wieku, 1 (Cracow and Warsaw, 1881).

[64] E.g., in E 3179 (p. 61), Eminek clearly indicates that Ḥağike is his full brother; this is corroborated by Muscovite sources.

[65] Halil Inalcik, "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy: The Crimean Khanate under Sahib Giray I," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4 (1979–1980) = *Eucharisterion: Essays presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Cambridge, Mass.): 445–466, especially p. 454.

[66] There are some misprints in the Širin genealogy: for "Barğïrgân" read "Bağïrgân," and for the reign of Ağïš instead of "1508–1593" read "1508–1523."

princes that never became khans, *qalġa*s, or *nūreddīn*s. Certain gaps or doubtful points in the genealogy and chronology of reigns will surely be filled or resolved as new documents on the Crimea become available.[67]

The glossary contains about 200 terms, most of which occur in the documents, although some are relevant Slavic and other terms that come up in the commentaries. The non-Ottomanist will find the glossary most helpful for understanding the documents and commentaries.

The annotated bibliography at the end of the volume is one of the more extensive on the Crimean Khanate published to date. Especially useful are the annotated survey of source guides and publications and the annotated list of Crimean and relevant Ottoman chronicles. There is also a rare section listing travel accounts by European visitors to the Crimea. However, these features notwithstanding, the value of the bibliography as a reference aid is greatly undermined by its technical shortcomings. The majority of the German entries are garbled in one way or another.[68] Polish titles, besides also often being

[67] We can resolve some points in the chronology of reigns and some doubts in the genealogy noted by the editors and also fill some gaps by using new documents. For example, about Khan ʿĀdil Giray (1665 or 1666–1670 or 1671) there is a question in the *nūreddīn* (second heir-apparent) column of the chronological table (p. 365). However, Devlet Giray (b. Feth̲ Giray), in a letter dated Rebīʿ I 1077/October 1666, refers to himself as the *nūreddīn*; see Josef Matuz, *Krimtatarische Urkunden in Reichsarchiv zu Kopenhagen. Mit historisch-diplomatischen und sprachlichen Untersuchungen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1976), pp. 166, 170 and pl. X. In the same row doubt is expressed about whether ʿĀdil Giray is the son of Aḥmed Giray or Devlet Giray (not the same Devlet Giray as above), and in the genealogy ʿĀdil Giray is presented as the son of Aḥmed Giray and the brother of Devlet Giray. However, information in another letter by ʿĀdil Giray (b. Devlet Giray) (Matuz, *Krimtatarische Urkunden,* pp. 158, 160 and pl. VIII) is in line with what we already know from Seyyid Muḥammed Rïżā, *Es-sebʿ üs-seyyār fī aḫbāri mülūki Tatar,* ed. Kazem-Bek (Kazan, 1832), pp. 174, 178, 179: namely, that ʿĀdil Giray and Feth̲ Giray were sons of Devlet Giray, and that Feth̲ Giray had a son also named Devlet Giray. Another addition to the chronology of reigns is Toqtamïš Giray (b. Ṣafā Giray), who at one time was *qalġa* to Murād Giray (1677–1683) (Matuz, *Krimtatarische Urkunden,* pp. 227, 230 and pl. XXI); he, too, should be added to the genealogy under Ṣafā Giray (b. Selāmet Giray). These are only a few additions and corrections. It would be useful to revise and update the genealogy of the Giray dynasty on the basis of new as well as old sources. One example of underutilized material in an old source is Vel'jaminov-Zernov's *Matériaux,* which has many letters from ʿĀdil Giray b. Mübārek Giray (a *nūreddīn* to Islām Giray III and Meḥmed Giray IV), who is not given in the genealogy. Also, note that "Šaqay" was the cognomen of Rezmī Selāmet Giray's brother Mübārek Giray, and not that of Rezmī Selāmet's son Mübārek as incorrectly indicated on the genealogical table. Finally, a line connecting Mengli Giray I to his sons has been overlooked.

[68] For example, the bibliography gives Rypka, "Brief Wechsel" instead of "Briefwechsel" (p. 406); Babinger, "*Geschichsschreiber*" and "*Geschichtesschreiber*" instead of "*Geschichtsschreiber*" (pp. 410, 411, 416); Zettersteen, "*persischë* . . ." instead of ". . . *persische* . . ." (p. 409). In the short bibliography attached to

garbled, lack diacritics,[69] and some Russian and Ukrainian titles are incorrect.[70] Turkish entries, too, are marred by inconsistent citations.[71] The section listing important chronicles contains several inaccuracies and omissions. It is stated that Zajączkowski's edition of Rïḍvānpašazāde's *Tevārīḫ-i Dešt-i Qïpčaq* is in Qïpčaq Turkic, whereas it is actually in straightfoward Ottoman Turkish (the author was the son of the former Ottoman governor of Kefe, and not a Tatar). Furthermore it is claimed that Zajączkowski's edition provides a French critical translation (p. 411); in fact, as stated above, it contains an eighteenth-century abridged translation. For *Tārīḫ-i Moḥammed Giray* it is stated that Moḥammed Giray is the son of Ḥāǧī Selīm Giray, whereas he was in fact the son of Mübārek Giray (p. 410).[72] Inalcik has already pointed out that two important Crimean chronicles are not listed, namely, ʿAbd ül-Ġaffār, *ʿUmdet üt-Tevārīḫ*[73] and Ötemiš Ḥāǧī, *Tārīḫ-i Dost Sulṭān.*[74/75] In addition, Zygmunt Abrahamowicz's edition of Meḥmed Ṣenāʾī's chronicle of the reign of Islām Giray III is not given.[76] Although the bibliography was not intended to be exhaustive, the following works should have been included together with the above-mentioned publications by Ö. Gökbilgin (fn. 23), Hammer (fn. 42), Inalcik (fn. 8), Pritsak (fn. 14), Pułaski (fn. 63), Rypka (fn. 45): Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, ed., *Katalog dokumentów tureckich 1. Dokumenty do dziejów Polski i krajów ościennych w latach 1455–1672,* Katalog rękopisów orientalnych z zbiorów polskich, vol. 1, pt. 1 (Warsaw, 1959); D. Dorošenko and J. Rypka, "Hejt-

---

the glossary we have Hammer, *Staat verfassung und Staat verwaltung,* instead of *Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung* (p. 404).

69 For example, Zajaczkowski is given instead of Zajączkowski (p. 409); Baitosewicz, J., *Poglad na stosunki Polski z Turcja . . . ,* instead of Bartosewicz, J., *Pogląd . . . Turcją . . .* (p. 416); Aleksander Dubinski, Stanislawa Plaskowicka-Rymkiewicz . . . *Ksiega Pordozy Ewliji Czelebiego (Wybor)* . . . Ksiazka i Wiedza . . . , instead of . . . Dubiński, Stanisława Płaskowicka-Rymkiewicz . . . *Księga Podróży . . . (Wybór)* . . . Książka . . . (p. 416).

70 The only Ukrainian title is badly distorted. In the transcription system used in *Le Khanat de Crimée,* "Krymskij, A. E. 'Studii z Krimu' . . . in: *Istorično Filigino viddilu Vseukrainoskoj Akademii Nauk . . . Filologična Ketedra, Turkologečeskaja Komissaja . . .*" should read ". . . *Zbirnyk Istoryčno-Filolohičnoho viddilu Vseukrajins'koji . . . Filolohična Katedra, Tjurkolohična Komisija . . .*" (p. 420).

71 Why, for example, "Tavârikh," but "Dešt" (stress added), in "*Tavârikh-i Dešt-i Qïpčaq*" (p. 411).

72 See Smirnov, *Krymskoe xanstvo,* p. xvi.

73 ʿAbd ül-Ġaffār, *ʿUmdet üt-Tevārīḫ,* ed. Neǧīb ʿĀṣim, *Türk tārīḫ engümeni meǧmūʿasï,* supplement (Istanbul, 1343/1925–1926).

74 Still in manuscript form. See Zeki Velidi Togan, *Tarihte usul* (Istanbul, 1969), p. 224.

75 Inalcik, "Tribal Aristocracy," fn. 5.

76 Qïrïmlï Ḥāǧī Meḥmed Ṣenāʾī, *Üčüngü Islām Giray tārīḫi,* ed., trans. and with commentary by Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, with additional commentary by Olgierd Górka and Zbigniew Wójcik (Warsaw, 1971).

man Petr Dorošenko a jeho turecká politika," *Časopis Národního Musea* (Prague), 107 (1933): 1–55; D. Dorošenko and J. Rypka, "Polsko, Ukrajina, Krym a Vysoká Porta v první pol. XVII. stol.," *Časopis Národního Musea* 109 (1935): 19–49; Evlija Čelebi, *Kniga putešestvija. Izvelečenija sočinenija tureckogo putešestvennika XVII veka: Perevod i kommentarii,* no. 1: *Zemli Moldavii i Ukrainy,* ed. A. S. Tveritinova (Moscow, 1961); Walther Hinz, "Zwei Steuerbefreiungs-Urkunden," in *Documenta Islamica Inedita,* ed. J. W. Fück (Berlin, 1952), pp. 211–230; Fuad M. Köprülü, "Altın Ordu'ya ait yeni araştırmalar," *Belleten* 5 (1941): 397–436; S. E. Malov, "Izučenie jarlykov i vostočnyx gramot," in *Akademiku Vladimiru Aleksandroviču Gordelevskomu k ego semidesjatiletiju: Sbornik statej* (Moscow, 1953), pp. 187–195; Kazimierz Pułaski, "Machmet-Girej, chan Tatarów perekopskich i stosunki jego z Polską (1515–1523)," in *Szkice i poszukiwania historyczne,* vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1898), pp. 281–350; Helmuth Scheel, "Ein Schreiben des Krim Giraj Khan an den Prinzen Heinrich, den Bruder Friedrichs des Grossen," *Jean Deny Armağanı,* ed. János Eckmann et al. (Ankara, 1958), pp. 213–220; Abdullah Zihni Soysal, *Z dziejów Krymu: Polityka — kultura — emigracja,* Prace Młodzieży Krymskiej na emigracji, 1 (Warsaw, 1938).

The indexes of personal names and geographical names are rather extensive and cover both the document translations and the commentaries. Occasionally entries in the geographical index are incorrectly or misleadingly identified. Thus, for example, under Arad the reader is referred to Varad, correctly identified as a town in Transylvania. However, Arad is a town 100 km. south of Várad, an abbreviation for the Hungarian Nagyvárad, today in Romanian called Oradea-Mare. A key fortified town of the region, Várad was held by the Ottomans from 1661 to 1692. The commentary in which Várad is mentioned refers to the Habsburg siege of 1692 (p. 303), whereas Arad had already been taken by the Habsburgs seven years before, in 1685. Referring to the same context, the index identifies the fortress of Yanova as a locality in Moldavia, which would put the Habsburg armies somewhere east of the Carpathians. In fact, Yanova was the Turkish name for the castle of Jenő (Romanian Ineu) on the edge of the Great Hungarian Plain, halfway between Várad and Temesvár (Timişoara). For another example, in the index Ujvar is identified merely as "ville de Hongrie," a designation which would make it very difficult to locate on modern maps. A short name for the old Hungarian fortress Érsekújvár (held by the Ottomans 1663–1685), Újvár can be located on modern maps as the town of Nové Zámky in Czechoslovakia, which the index should have indicated.

On the whole, the volume could have been more carefully proofread and edited, given the reputation of the publisher, Mouton, and its price.[77] I have

[77] The following is a partial list of misprints, excluding the ones already mentioned in the course of this review: on the fold-out map of the Black Sea region

drawn attention to inconsistencies and inaccuracies because they defeat the purpose of a critical apparatus as extensive as that in *Le Khanat de Crimée*. However, such objections and criticisms aside, it is unquestionable that the appearance of this volume has done much to fill a void in Crimean and Ottoman as well as East European historical studies. Considering the difficulties in deciphering and interpreting documents such as these, in the future even greater cooperation will be necessary between Turkish and Slavic specialists.[78] For the present, scholars should very much appreciate the great service rendered by the French team in bringing us closer to finally opening the Ottoman archives and unraveling their secrets for the general historical community. We can hardly overestimate the great patience, perseverance, and command of paleography, as well as the familiarity with the history of the region, that made it possible for the editors to sort out and identify most of these barely legible, mostly undated, and often nondescript documents. As both a source publication and reference work, *Le Khanat de Crimée* will

there are two dots for cities that are not labeled — presumably the one immediately west of Kaffa is supposed to be Eski Qrïm, while the one immediately northeast of Bāğčesarāy (Baxčysaraj) is supposed to be Aq Masğid (Simferopol'); on p. 1, for "vezhovenstvom" read "verhovenstvom"; on p. 7, fn. 8, for "Ts.A.G.A.D.A." read "Ts.G.A.D.A."; on p. 103, for "E. 6639" read "E. 6398"; on p. 109, for "E. 1301" read "E. 1308(1301)/2"; on p. 130, for "E 991" read "E 9991"; on p. 156, for "juin 1635–octobre 1641" read "juin 1637–octobre 1641"; on p. 231, for "1063 (decembre 1752–novembre 1753" read "1163 (decembre 1752–novembre 1753)"; on p. 251, for "Yağtïqdjïzâde" read "Yağlïqdjïzâde"; on pp. 387–88, the glossary entry "dîl" is interrupted by the entry "djiziye"; on p. 393, for "*iltiram*" read "*iltizâm*"; on p. 410, for "1327(1911)" read "1327(1909)"; on p. 445, for "Cosaques Qosavi (Kosevoj)" read "Cosaques Qošavi (Koševoj)"; on p. 448, for "Kilâfâv localité du Budjaq *26*" read "Kilâfâv localité du Budjaq *266*"; on p. 449, for "Kölenli-Irdje" read "Kökenli-Irdje"; on p. 454, for "Yapunca" read "Yapunča."

78 Under preparation is a volume of Ottoman and Venetian documents concerning the activity of Prince Dmytro Vyšnevec'kyj and the rise of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, under the editorship of Alexandre Bennigsen, Mihnea Berindei, Halil Inalcik, Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, Omeljan Pritsak, Frank Sysyn, and Gilles Veinstein. Other volumes being planned include Ottoman documentation on the Black Sea raids of the Cossacks and Ottoman sources for the Xmel'nyc'kyj movement. These works are to be published jointly by the Groupe de recherche sur l'histoire médiévale de l'Europe orientale et de l'Empire ottoman at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (Paris) and the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University.

certainly occupy an important place in the sorely neglected field of Crimean and North Black Sea history.*

Harvard University

* In July 1983, after this review had been prepared for publication, I had the opportunity to work in the Topkapı Palace Museum Archives and to examine the originals of most of the documents published in *Le Khanat de Crimée*. I found that in many cases the editors, perhaps because they were working from microfilms, had missed important information contained on the reverse side of the documents. Such information includes full or partial identification of the author, addressee or date of the document, in the form of short invocatory inscriptions, seals or both. In many cases this shows the editors' attempts at contextual attribution and dating of these documents to have been either superfluous or mistaken. The missing information will be included in my forthcoming review of *Le Khanat de Crimée* in *The Journal of Turkish Studies* (Cambridge, Mass.).

REVIEWS

THE SLAVIC LITERARY LANGUAGES. Edited by *A. M. Schenker* and *E. Stankiewicz*. New Haven: Yale Consilium on International and Area Studies, 1980. 287 pp. $18.50.

A person belonging to the same Polish or central European culture as the editors of this book will have no difficulty understanding that their work must be essentially about standard languages in their written form. The typical English reader might, however, think that the book is about languages of higher literary genres, because in his culture it is not customary to consider the language of newspapers, business, law, science, textbooks, mystery novels, or personal letters as "literary." Therefore one wishes that the Foreword of this book had provided some explanation. It states only that this study is an outline of "the external histories" (J. Baudouin de Courtenay's term) of Slavic literary languages, that is, with emphasis put on "cultural and ideological aspects."

If such a book is to serve not only factographic purposes in the Slavic field but general linguistic and humanistic ones as well, it should help the reader understand how a written language is transformed into a standard one. What are the factors in such a transformation? A spoken language may be reflected or masked by a number of literary languages built from different elements, native and foreign, with a resulting discontinuity of literary language development (e.g., Ukrainianized Church Slavonic, chancellery Ruthenian [shared with White-Ruthenians], Slavonic-Rhossic [shared with Muscovites-Russians], vernacular-based Neo-Ukrainian, Ukrainianized Russian, Carpatho-Ruthenian—all in the area of the same spoken language). Therefore it is useful to determine the point in time from which the literary language of a given linguistic area has been developing without any more interruptions or zigzags, except for some natural and inevitable modifications.

The thirteen articles—by R. Picchio, V. Pinto, B. Koneski, K. E. Naylor, E. Stankiewicz, A. McMillin, A. V. Issatschenko, G. Y. Shevelov, R. Auty, Z. Topolińska, A. M. Schenker, L. Ďurovič, and R. Polański—contained in the book under review allow us to distinguish a number of factors which operated or seemed to operate at those final turning points in the history of Slavic literary languages:

Translation of religious texts. This was a factor in the standardization of the two oldest Slavic literary languages—Church Slavonic and Czech. Church Slavonic was probably standardized in the form which is now considered canonic in the Ohrid school of St. Clement, the "first bishop of the Bulgarian tongue," in the late ninth century. It was probably there that the central and western Macedonian *ḱ* and *ǵ* (Cyrillo-Methodian) and Moravian *c* and *z* were replaced by western Macedonian *št* and *žd.* The Czech literary language was standardized by the mid-fifteenth century, owing to continuous work on the translation of religious texts from the late thirteenth century (hymns, *vitae*, Scriptures, etc.), also preserving in part the traditions of the Moravian Church Slavonic literary language which had operated until the late eleventh century. In the geographically restricted Lower Lusatian (Sorabic) language, the publication of a translation of the New Testament in 1709, based on the dialect of Chośebuz (Cottbus), determined the Chośebuz base of standard Lower Lusatian.

Intervention of printers. This factor influenced Polish, whose standard was established in the early sixteenth century by (mostly German) printers in Cracow. They turned to producing and selling Polish books for profit and standardized spelling and printing in the process.

Imitation of an elegant secular language. It was the imitation of French by the Russian aristocracy (who thought in French and spoke in Russian) between roughly 1760 and 1825 that created the modern standard Russian language.

Influential publicistic works and journals. In Bulgaria, the educator Vasil Aprilov, who was from the eastern part of the country, initiated a discussion on the language standard in his circular letter of 1836. His book of 1847 demolished the extremist archaizers as well as settled, by offering a compromise, the controversy between vernacularists and traditionalists. In Slovenia, it was debate in the leading journals of the 1860s, primarily in J. Bleiweis's *Kmetijske in Rokodelske Novice*, that achieved an interdialectal compromise between Upper Carniola and Styria on the literary standard. For White Ruthenian it was through the Vilnius-based periodical *Niva* (1906–1915), which united practically everybody who wrote in that language, that a rough linguistic standard—a synthetic amalgam, most closely resembling the central dialects of the Minsk area—was achieved.

Influential writers. This is the case of Ukrainian, in which the creation of a new standard language, based on southeastern dialects, is attributed to the Romantic writers T. Ševčenko and P. Kuliš (roughly 1840–1860).

Contract. It was the "Literary Agreement" (*Književni dogovor*) signed in March 1850 in Vienna by two Serbian linguists and five Croatian intellectuals that created the Serbo-Croatian standard language, based on the neutral dialect of Hercegovina. A year later, and probably under the inspiration of the Serbo-Croatian contract, a similar agreement on the unification of different central Slovak literary languages was concluded by

Lutheran and Catholic leaders in Slovakia and was promulgated in a grammar of 1852, the preface of which was signed by three Lutherans and three Catholics.

Influential linguistic publications. A limited standard (in spelling, but not in morphology or phonetics) was established by K. Nitsch in 1911 for Kashubian, a literary language with a limited function (in regional belles-lettres).

Intervention of the state. More or less simultaneously, soon after 1945, authorities in two communist countries, Yugoslavia and East Germany, caused the final standardization of two small Slavic languages—Macedonian and Upper Lusatian (where a division between Catholic and Protestant literary languages had existed until World War II).

It is striking how late the role of the state appears in this summary (and the two cases where it does are both communist states). The political rebirth of Serbs and Bulgarians in the nineteenth century did not have any decisive influence on the establishment of their standard languages. In both cases the time of standardization either followed (Serbia) or preceded (Bulgaria) the restoration of political sovereignty, and the standard was not based on the dialects of the capitals of the sovereign entities (Belgrade, Sofia). Another striking fact is the limited role of linguists in establishing a standard language. Only in the atypical case of Kashubian and, partly, in the case of Serbo-Croatian can a major role be assigned to linguists. In other cases it was, rather, the clerical translators of sacred texts, foreign printers and booksellers, aristocrats, educators, journalists, belletrists, religious and political leaders (some of them also doubling as amateur linguists) who created the standard languages discussed in this book. In general, the book confirms what many consider axiomatic: that whereas spoken languages are products of uncontrollable and subconscious or unconscious evolution (and thus are "natural"), standard languages are products of conscious human decisions (and therefore are "artificial").

Bohdan Struminsky
Harvard University

MODERN UKRAINIAN. By *Assya Humesky.* Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980. 438 pp. $8.00, paper.

An introductory textbook cannot be all things to all students, and therefore when evaluating such a work one must take into account its intended goals and audience. A. Humesky's *Modern Ukrainian* takes a traditional four skills approach (reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension). It is intended for use with an instructor and is aimed at students interested in acquiring a knowledge of the Ukrainian literary standard in use outside of

the USSR. The author makes frequent reference to regional and stylistic variants and the Soviet Ukrainian literary standard, however, and thus the student interested in Soviet Ukrainian can also profit from the book.

The work contains twenty-one lessons consisting of an unnumbered lesson on the phonological and graphic systems and twenty numbered lessons covering the traditional morphological topics with notes on syntactic and semantic features. There are five appendices, a grammatical index, and Ukrainian-English/English-Ukrainian vocabulary indices comprising approximately 1,500 main entries. An accompanying set of tapes can be obtained from the Slavic Department of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

The introduction to the sound and writing systems conveys all the necessary information and gives common expressions and appropriate vocabulary for memorization. Unfortunately, this section is marred by minor inconsistencies and typographical errors not listed in the errata sheet. Thus, for example, the list of hard consonants (7–8) does not indicate that *p* is unaspirated, and no example is given after the description of *t*; *k* is the only voiceless stop with both a description and an example. Although the non-aspiration of all voiceless stops is indicated in a note following the list (8), consistency in the initial presentation would be better for the student. While the omission of *y* from the list of the six vowels of Ukrainian (10) or the printing of у instead of я in the list of vowel letters following an apostrophe after a labial (18) are inconveniences which the instructor can easily catch and point out to students, nonetheless the instructor must be constantly alert, as the book contains many such errors.

The twenty numbered lessons have a consistent organization: a series of dialogues or readings with English translations followed by a vocabulary and explanatory notes, the formal grammar lesson, and a set of thirteen to twenty-six exercises. One unfortunate feature of the organization is that it does not follow the intended order of presentation (XIII). Thus the instructor is expected to present the different dialogues of the lesson on different days with appropriate grammar, vocabulary, and exercises. This places a considerable burden on the teacher, since the order of presentation of grammatical information does not follow the order of the dialogues and the vocabulary list is cumulative for each lesson rather than by dialogue. On the positive side, the exercises are varied and explicitly coordinated with the different sections of the grammar lesson.

The order of presenting grammatical information is traditional, but the manner of presentation needs improvement. Greater use should have been made of clearly labeled tables. Thus, for example, the table of present tense conjugation (p. 57) is badly mislabeled, and, in the case of the first conjugation, uses different verbs to illustrate different persons. Although the tables on the following pages are clearer, there is no such clarification after the presentation of the compound imperfective future in *-m-* (p. 104). After a statement of the rule of formation, a list of four infinitives, each followed by two different personal forms in no particular

order, is given. As the appendices lack any conjugation tables, this absence of coherent illustrative paradigms places a considerable burden on the student.

The treatment of declensional types confuses the labeling of gender and declension. Thus the grammatical explanation (pp. 54–56) uses the terms *feminine declension* (*a*-type and *e*-type) and *masculine-neuter declension*. Hence the masculine noun Мико́ла belongs to the feminine declension (*a*-type). The treatment of declensional types is better in Appendix 4 (pp. 380–383), although no masculine examples are given for the *a*-declension (not "type"). Even here, however, neuter *n/t*-stems (e.g., ім'я, дівча́) are treated with the so-called masculine-neuter declension rather than with the so-called *e*-declension, where they belong. The author should have used the traditional numerical labels (*first, second, third declension*) thus keeping the concept of paradigmatic classes based on endings (declension) distinct from the concept of gender.

There is a wealth, perhaps even a plethora, of cultural and stylistic information given in the explanatory notes. Thus, for example, the explanation of борщ (p. 161) includes the information that: ". . . one cook book [*sic*] lists 22 varieties, including one which is called 'Polish.'" This is no problem for the student, provided the instructor distinguishes essential and ancillary information.

Despite its shortcomings, *Modern Ukrainian* is a valuable contribution to the teaching of Ukrainian, and with proper guidance any student can acquire from it a broad and sound understanding of both the language and the culture.

Victor A. Friedman
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

THE POET AS MYTHMAKER: A STUDY OF SYMBOLIC MEANING IN TARAS ŠEVČENKO. By *George G. Grabowicz*. Monograph Series. Cambridge, Mass.: Havard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982. x, 170 pp. $12.50. Distributed by Harvard University Press.

In Ukrainian history no personality is more intensely revered in the printed word than Taras Ševčenko. A two-volume bibliography, covering the period between 1839 and 1959, contains almost ten thousand entries, written primarily in Ukrainian and Russian and, with a few exceptions, published either in imperial Russia or the Soviet Union. Another ten thousand bibliographic items appeared in a supplementary volume

covering the years 1960 to 1964. Since then thousands more have certainly been written by interpreters and eulogists not only in the Soviet Union, but also in the West. In purely quantitative terms such a flood of printed words might yield a comparison with writings about Walt Whitman in the United States or Rainer Maria Rilke in Germany. This represents a challenge to anyone who seeks to add something original to the bibliography on Ševčenko. In his book, *The Poet as Mythmaker*, George G. Grabowicz undertook that challenge and, in a certain sense, has dealt with it successfully.

The originality of Grabowicz's book can be asserted even without any attempt to master the literature about Ševčenko and, in fact, without knowing very much about Ševčenko's poetic text and its spell on native speakers of Ukrainian. Grabowicz makes it clear that "the surface and manifest level" of Ševčenko's Ukrainian poetry and the aesthetic impact of its "visible features" are not his primary target. His dominant concern is the concealed meaning of Ševčenko's "symbolic system" and "the immanent and textually given structure of his thought." Using the terminology of transformational grammarians and cyberneticians, Grabowicz focuses "on the code and the underlying structures." This focusing, in his view, "necessitates for the most part a bracketing of the concrete aesthetic object and with it frequent suspension of aesthetic judgement."

While transformational grammarians seek the deep structure in abstract relations between the nominal and verbal phrases of individual sentences, Grabowicz, using the term more figuratively, seeks "the deep structure" of Ševčenko's Ukrainian poetry "in the symbolic and 'paradigmatic' order of his poetry, the overarching model of which is myth." For Grabowicz "the mythical nature of Ševčenko's poetry is unmistakable." He is convinced that "myth constitutes a fundamental code of Ševčenko's poetry." Ševčenko "has become the product and hero of his own myth," says Grabowicz, paraphrasing the well-known dictum of Claude Lévi-Strauss.

Clearly, the uniqueness of Grabowicz's book is lodged in its methodological underpinning, which synthesizes diverse concepts of modern studies in the humanities, including analysis of symbolic representation, Jungian theorizing about archetypes, Frye's inquiries into myth in literature and, in particular, various anthropological studies of human culture. While Claude Lévi-Strauss considered modern linguistics a model for structural anthropology, Grabowicz sees structural anthropology as a model for his study of Ševčenko and, by implication, accepts the anthropological use (legitimate and otherwise) of various linguistic terms and concepts, such as the Saussurian distinction between the syntagmatic and paradigmatic (associative) axes, Jakobsonian "code," and Chomskyan "deep structure." At the same time, however, Grabowicz, as he himself readily admits, "did not set out to follow any particular school of analysis"—and it is precisely his combination of various approaches and their corresponding terminological contraband that strikingly marks this book. Thus his work is not only a study of Ševčenko, the mythmaker, but

also an epistemological venture into the field of literary criticism. Various approaches are not only accepted and applied, but also interpreted and assessed, whether directly or by implication.

Although the epigraph to Grabowicz's book is a quotation from Claude Lévi-Strauss's *Structural Anthropology*, Grabowicz in his study actually contradicts the principal difference between myth and poetry made by Lévi-Strauss in his *Structural Anthropology*, where we find the following:

> Myth should be placed in the gamut of linguistic expressions at the end opposite to that of poetry, in spite of all the claims which have been made to prove the contrary. Poetry is a kind of speech which cannot be translated except at the cost of serious distortions, whereas the mythical value of the myth is preserved even through the worst translation. Whatever our ignorance of the language and the culture of the people where it originated, a myth is still felt as a myth by any reader anywhere in the world. Its substance does not lie in its style, its original music, or its syntax, but in the *story* which it tells. Myth is language, functioning on an especially high level where meaning succeeds practically at "taking off" from the linguistic ground on which it keeps rolling.

Now, it would be unfair to claim that Grabowicz is unaware of the crucial role of the Ukrainian language for Ševčenko's verse. He himself points out the difference between Ševčenko's Ukrainian and Russian poetry, on the one hand, and Ševčenko's verse and prose, on the other. He knows that it is Ševčenko's special use of Ukrainian in poetry which constitutes the pinnacle of his artistic expression and, in fact, constitutes his greatness. Yet, for Grabowicz this is not enough to explain Ševčenko's role as a prophet of his nation who "gave his people the ability to rediscover themselves and with that to gain a sense of reborn vitality."

In Grabowicz's view, it was not the artfulness of Ševčenko's Ukrainian verse, its euphony and the corresponding spell of sound but, rather, its mythological, paraphrasable content which made him a prophet of his nation and a mythological figure. For that reason Grabowicz's book does not concentrate on Ševčenko's skill in using the Ukrainian language for a work of art, but tries to illuminate Ševčenko's ability to be a myth-carrier who "not only makes the mythical construct but also becomes a participant in it." From Grabowicz's anthropological viewpoint, Ševčenko appears "like a shaman who mediates between the earth and sky" and "who consciously articulates the myth to his people and both consciously and unconsciously, like a shaman, serves them as mediator between past and present and present and future, man and God, and, ultimately, through his suffering, expiates for the collective 'sin' and 'curse.'" Clearly, such an approach has very little in common with analyses of Ševčenko by Dmytro Čyževs'kyj or George Shevelov or, for that matter, by anyone concerned with the problem of how Ševčenko's Ukrainian verse was created and what makes it a work of verbal art. Grabowicz's book is epistemologically the exact opposite of Roman Ingarden's *The Literary Work of Art*, which Grabowicz translated into English and published with insightful comments in 1973. By comparing Ševčenko with a shaman in a primitive society, Grabowicz made out of his study an anthropological

discourse rather than an inquiry into a literary work of art. Evidently, this happened by design rather than by coincidence. It is precisely in this sense that his book is rather original and very provocative indeed.

Ladislav Matejka
University of Michigan

THE MASTER'S JESTS. By *Ivan Franko.* Translated by *Roman Tatchyn.* With an introduction by *Leonid Rudnytzky.* New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1979. 133 pp. $10.00.

Every translation of a Ukrainian literary work, particularly into a language of wide currency, is an event in Ukrainian cultural life. This is mainly because the field of translation has been neglected in the Soviet Ukraine, especially translation into Western languages, as a result of the party-government's restrictive policies regarding Ukrainian literature and the lack of specialists in Western languages. The translation of Ukrainian works that have been appearing—until recently—in the Soviet Union through "Meždunarodnaja Kniga" in Moscow are translations of Russian translations. Only recently has the Kievan publishing house "Dnipro" started to publish direct translations of Ukrainian works. In these circumstances, Roman Tatchyn's translation into English of Franko's poem *Pans'ki žarty* (The Master's Jests), published in the West, is a commendable contribution to the field.

Tatchyn's translation concentrates mainly on retaining the rhyme and meter of the original, which the translator believes constitute the poem's most salient stylistic features. In order to preserve the work's basic iambic tetrameter, the translator resorted to the use of elisions, which give the English version an archaic coloring and feel, and dissolve both the immediacy of the father's tale and the lyricism that is very present in the original. The effort to preserve the original's iambic tetrameter often leads the translator to use not the most accurate words, but those that satisfy the requirements of meter or rhyme, for example: "A Moško zakupyv selo" is translated "And Moishe mortgaged up the town," in order to rhyme with "sound"; or "Tam kožnyj pan stupav tak bučno" is rendered "Back then all Masters seemed as clever," to rhyme with "endeavor."

Obvious lexical problems confronting the translator are the poem's dialecticisms, phraseology, and proverbs. However, in most cases, the translator is successful in transmitting both the sense and the spirit of these stylistic components: "Komisar ani v vus ne duv"—"The commissar cared not a shill," or "Zamakitrytjsja vam svit"—"You'll hold your

sanity in doubt," etc. Moreover, he incorporates the Polish and German dialogues and other linguistic borrowings into the translation, thus preserving the local color of the original. The translation of the poem in general reveals Tatchyn's feel for the language of the original and his good grasp of the nuances of the English language.

The introduction to the translation is written by Leonid Rudnytzky. In his opinion, *The Master's Jests* gives the American reader "an insight into the spiritual make-up of the Ukrainian people and, to some extent, into that of Ivan Franko" (p. 12). The power and beauty of the poem lie "in Franko's realistic depiction of the milieu and his warm and vibrant portrayal of the people in it" (p. 10). As such, Franko gives us "a faithful replica of a 19th-century Galician village" (p. 10). The poem's protagonists, he states, are the villagers who, degraded and exploited by the master, suffer from poverty and alcoholism. Apart from Master Migucki, the characters remain nameless, which gives the work a "symbolic dimension," while some elements of the poem, especially the person of the commissar, point—in Rudnytzky's view—to the poem's kinship with German Naturalism. Rudnytzky places particular emphasis on Franko's characterization of his heroes through the "well developed speech pattern of each individual character" (p. 10). The poem, according to Rudnytzky, is saturated with a "pronounced Christian ethos," which is evidenced by the village church being the focus of its events, by the variety of synonyms relating to the concept of God, and by the usage of ancient Ukrainian greetings and phrases such as "Christ is Risen." The priest's philosophy of "passive resistance to evil" derives from the "biblical imperative to turn the other cheek" and thereby "became a powerful symbol of Christianity" (p. 12). "Thus," Rudnytzky concludes, "Franko's *The Master's Jests* establishes the importance of the Ukrainian Church and Ukrainian spirituality to the Ukrainian people.... Perhaps, in writing the poem Franko tried to come to terms with his own existential dilemma and, having discovered this spiritual heritage within himself, he set an enduring monument to it in *The Master's Jests*" (pp. 12–13).

If we analyze the poem in the context of Franko's literary, community, and political activity and thought in the 1880s, some of Rudnytzky's conclusions must be questioned. The time of the writing of *The Master's Jests* was for Franko a time for re-evaluating some of his views and concepts, primarily those concerning the relation between reason and emotion and between the ideal and reality. He came to the realization that many of life's phenomena contradicted the conclusions he had reached in theoretical study. Franko's faith in the relevance of revolutionary slogans and in the imminence of social reforms was shaken. "We all," wrote Franko, "held the view . . . , it was held at times by both Marx and Engels, that in 10–15 years the great socialist revolution will come and the workers will take control into their own hands." The change in Franko's political views was also influenced by Bismarck's so-called socialist reforms, in whose wake leading German socialists abandoned the idea of revolution and

decided to turn their attention to the scientific formulation of socioeconomic questions. Also, Franko ceased to believe in the feasibility of a revolution in Austrian-ruled Ukraine because he saw that the basic notion of organization was alien to the peasantry. Referring to the Polish uprising of 1846, which he was researching at the time of writing *The Master's Jests*, Franko observed that for individuals to speak in the name of an entire people, when that people is not ready for revolution, is an absurdity. He developed the position that the class struggle and the revolt of the uneducated and unenlightened masses can only be blind retaliation for injustices, a revenge that would not bring about a lasting solution. What was needed was an ideal, and the long, patient labor of individual intellectuals directed at bringing the masses to a full understanding of that ideal. The intelligentsia should lead the masses in accordance with the spirit of the times; it should educate them to "free thought in the religious field, to true humanism in the ethical field, to fraternity and association in the economic field. . . ."

Against the strong opposition of Myxajlo Drahomanov, Franko decided to join the populists, and accepted an editorial position with the daily *Dilo.* His aim was to convince the populists that even within the narrowly circumscribed area allowed to peasant activity by the Austrian government, significant progress could be made. Franko also wished to correct the deeply rooted view of some Ukrainian populist intellectuals that baseness and brutality are endemic to the peasant.

Out of this Weltanschauung emerge the central motifs and symbolism of the poem *The Master's Jests.* In the person of the village priest, Franko portrays a leader who, through educating the village youth and through his own goodness and high morality, leads the community to thought and at least a partial understanding of the concept of freedom. Here, complete harmony exists between the leader and the masses, an element not found in Franko's later poems, such as *Moses.* In the person of Migucki, the landowner and master, Franko symbolizes the long-present foreign power that has reduced the people to slavish submission and has transformed them into a passive and powerless mass; in the person of the village tavernkeeper the poet embodies the force which abets the foreign power to keep the people in submission; finally, the commissar personifies the minimal privileges accorded the Ukrainian people by the Austrian government. The poet also uses the commissar partially to disclose the inner world and psyche of the villagers, whose essential nature is good and moral.

The main idea behind the father's story of serfdom's injustices is not to stir within the children desire for revenge, but to give them strength and courage in the face of continued bondage, "for the evil is still here." The abolition of serfdom is only a partial realization of the ideal, for the people do not yet have a full comprehension of the ideal of freedom and are not ready for its complete realization. It is with this philosophic generalization that Franko concludes his poem.

It stems from the above discussion that the poem is not a rehabilitation of the role of the church among the Ukrainian people; it is not the discovery of the national Geist or ethos in either Franko's milieu or in himself; and it is not the poet's attempt to resolve his "existential dilemma." In my view, the poem is a philosophical dissection of the psyche and behavior of a degraded people, as well as an illustration of a stage in the constant and rapid evolution of Franko's views on the doctrinaire tendencies in the socialism of his day, on the complex nature of society in the broadest sense, and on the vital role of a conscientious leader of society. Essentially, it is an attempt to resolve the question of how to lead society out of spiritual and physical bondage. It is precisely when taken in this sense that the translation of *The Master's Jests* constitutes a useful contribution to English-language Frankiana.

Jaroslav Rozumnyj
University of Manitoba

DER GROSSE KOSAKENAUFSTAND 1648 GEGEN DIE POLNISCHE HERRSCHAFT: DIE RZECZPOSPOLITA UND DAS KOSAKENTUM IN DER ERSTEN PHASE DES AUFSTANDES. By *Dymitri Zlepko.* Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institutes München, 49. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980. 132 pp. DM 30, paper.

Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's hetmanate (1648–1657) began a distinctive period in the history of the Ukraine by laying a foundation for its claim to being a state among the contemporary European community of nations. Even though hundreds of primary and secondary source materials have already appeared in print concerning the Cossack hetman, interest about his achievements has not abated among historians. It is safe to say that Khmel'nyts'kyi and his times will continue to captivate not only the present generation of scholars and writers, but also future ones.

The monograph of Dymitri Zlepko is further evidence that research interest in this field is not waning. Judging by the inscription "Inaugural-Dissertation der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München," this book is a published version of Zlepko's doctoral dissertation. In it the author examines and evaluates the initial phase of the Cossack uprising led by Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, from the beginning of 1648 to the end of November of the same year.

A doctoral dissertation should contribute something original to the sum of knowledge, if only new organization or re-interpretation of already known source materials. Moreover, it should be based on a solid

foundation of research and analysis, for which a historian must secure every possible primary and secondary source relating to his topic. Zlepko's book, for the most part, falls short of these criteria.

The first weakness of the author's work is that it does not refer to any manuscript sources. Is it possible for a historian to gain a deep insight into the Khmel'nyts'kyi period without thoroughly examining primary manuscripts? Surely, the author cannot make the assumption that all the pertinent documents relating to his topic have been published. Various archives and libraries in several European countries contain indispensable unpublished materials for his topic. For example, the few pages which he devotes to the Convocation and Election Diets (pp. 57–62, 72–79) could have been significantly expanded, had he made use of the manuscript journals of these Diets, which are located in Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (Warsaw), Wojewódzkie Archiwum Państwowe w Gdańsku (Gdańsk), Biblioteka Czartoryskich (Cracow), and Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego (Wrocław). It is very difficult to understand why the author, who lives so close to European manuscript collections, chose to make no use of these sources.

The second weakness of the book is that Zlepko failed to consult many basic published sources relevant to his topic. For example, he makes no reference to the following: (a) collections of documents—*Akty Moskovskago gosudarstva*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1894), *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, pt. 3, vol. 4 (Kiev, 1914), *Księga pamiętnicza* (Cracow, 1864), *Ojczyste spominki*, vol. 2 (Cracow, 1845) and *Pamiatniki...*, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Kiev, 1898); (b) histories—W. Kochowski, *Annalium Poloniae...* (Cracow, 1683); (c) monographs—W. W. Kojałowicz, *De rebus anno 1648 et 1649...* (Vilnius, 1651); (d) chronicles and memoirs—M. Jemiłowski, *Pamiętnik...* (Lviv, 1850), J. Jerlicz, *Latopisiec*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1853), A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, vol. 4 (Wrocław, 1974), or its Polish translation, *Pamietnik*, vol. 3 (Warsaw, 1980). Moreover, not mentioned in his sources are compilations such as *Theatrum Europaeum*, vol. 6 (Frankfurt/Main, 1652); specific references to newspapers of the period, e.g., the Parisian *Gazette de France* (Borshchak's work on this source is incomplete); or even the German-language publications *Continuatio . . . der Zehnjährigen Historischen Relation* (Leipzig) and *Relationis historicae semestralis continuatio* (Frankfurt/Main).

This is only an incomplete list of the major sources available to scholars. Apparently the author did not examine the various bibliographies relating to his topic. Even a cursory look at M. Hrushevs'kyi's annotated bibliography in *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, new ed., vol. 8, pt. 2 (New York, 1956), would have revealed to Zlepko that he had left large gaps in the primary sources unfilled. His secondary materials have been consulted with greater care, although even here a few important titles are missing. With regard to missing sources, manuscript and printed, the author should have consulted the monograph of A. Kersten;[1] the recently-published

article of W. Majewski appeared too late to be used by him.[2]

These deficiencies in research lead to a third weakness of the book: lack of penetrating analysis. A work like Zlepko's should address certain questions with regard to the major events of the times or the motives and accomplishments of the leading figures. For example, why was it possible for Khmel'nyts'kyi to achieve military and political successes while he was still in Zaporozhe? Did he, at this early stage, visualize an autonomous or an independent Ukraine? How successful was he in using the major powers—the Commonwealth, Muscovy, and Turkey—for his own purposes? Answers are needed to these and other questions. Lacking many primary sources, Zlepko was unable to answer these and other questions and to offer a comprehensive analysis; consequently, the bulk of his work resembles a chronological sketch. Moreover, much of what he writes has already been established by such historians as M. Hrushevs'kyi and L. Kubala.

The many errors of fact in the text, confusing bibliographical entries and an incomplete index are the fourth weakness of Zlepko's book. With regard to the former, one can wonder whether the typescript was reviewed before its publication or whether the author corrected galley proofs. Apart from the many spelling mistakes and missing diacritical marks, there are more serious errors. Władysław Dominik Ostrogski-Zasławski appears as several persons: Dominik Zasławski (p. 50), Vladymyr Ostroz'kyj (p. 52), Władysław Dominik Zasławski (p. 59), and Bogusław Dominik Zasławski (p. 132). In 1645 Janusz Tyszkiewicz was a palatine, not a castellan, of Kiev (p. 10). Jacek Szemberk, not Stanisław Szemberg, was a commissioner of the registered Cossacks (p. 12). Command of troops was given to Andrzej, not Jerzy, Firlej (p. 59). "Lemberger Starost" was Adam Hieronim Sieniawski, not Jeronim Siniawski (p. 69). How is it possible for Ambroży Grabowski's (1782–1868) "Vater und Stiefvater" to have been "Privatsekretäre König Władysławs IV," who died in 1648? (p. 21). There are numerous other errors in the text as well.

The bibliography contains many confusing entries. It is the function of this auxiliary science of history to enable both those familiar and, especially, those unfamiliar with a topic to learn something about it. The bibliography in this work contains incomplete entries, such as that for A. Jabłonowski, or strange ones, like the abbreviation *ZNTiŠ* (*Z* stands for *Zapysky*). Moreover, the author should have made it clear that the separate entries for L. W., Lipiński, W., and Lypyns'kyj, V., refer to the same person; the same applies to Pricak, Omeljan and Pritsak, O., and to Gawroński, Fr. Rawita, and Rawita-Gawroński, Fr.

---

1 Adam Kersten, *Stefan Czarniecki, 1599–1665* (Warsaw, 1963).

2 Wiesław Majewski, "Krytyczny przegląd źródeł do dziejów powstania Chmielnickiego w okresie początkowym (jesień 1647–maj 1648)," *Studia Źródłoznawcze* 26 (1981): 141–64.

The index is marred by incorrect entries and spelling mistakes. The chief problem, however, is that it does not include names of persons or places mentioned in the footnotes (pp. 87–109).

Zlepko has written a very weak monograph. Since his name appears on the title page, he must take full responsibility for all its shortcomings. Nevertheless, his effort shows some potential which, if developed, could enhance his ability to write effectively in his chosen area of specialization. Of course, he must become more familiar with his field of research. Above all, he must seek expert advice, since part of the blame for the deficiencies of his dissertation must be laid on the shoulders of his advisors.

A. B. Pernal
Brandon University

A HISTORY OF THE HABSBURG EMPIRE, 1526–1918. By *Robert A. Kann.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1980. xiv, 648 pp. $10.95, paper.

Until his death in 1981, Robert A. Kann was generally acknowledged as the dean of Habsburg studies in North America and as one of the world's leading scholars of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In the work under review here, which proved to be his last major monograph, Kann attempted to provide a "historical introduction to the problems of the Habsburg Empire" (p. xiv). He has succeeded admirably, for the result is perhaps the best one-volume modern history of the Habsburg Empire in English.

In contrast to his predecessors who also wrote one-volume histories—Oscar Jaszi, Arthur May, A. J. P. Taylor, C. A. Macartney—Kann begins his narrative as far back as 1526–1527, at the birth of the Habsburg Empire following the union of the Austrian hereditary lands with the crowns of Bohemia, Hungary, and Croatia. From such a historical perspective, the reader is allowed to witness the rise of the empire to greatness and not simply its "inevitable" nineteenth-century "disintegration" that previous English-language surveys have all too often overemphasized. Kann's methodological approach is also refreshing, because he tries to look at each of the political and national components of the empire (sometimes at the expense of the narrative) and not to focus solely on developments at the imperial center or, as in the case of Macartney, on the Hungarian Kingdom.

Kann's interest in the nationalities of the Habsburg Empire goes back to his pioneering two-volume work, *The Multinational Empire* (1950, 3rd edition 1970). That interest is reflected in this general history, in which much attention is given to the political, socioeconomic, and especially cultural developments among each of the nationalities. The Ukrainians, or Ruthenians as they are referred to (reflecting the official Austro-German terminology *Ruthenen*), are mentioned in several places throughout this work, and they are singled out—as are other nationalities—in two sections on cultural developments before and after the 1860s (pp. 391–394 and 526–527). To be sure, such brief discussions can at best mention only the most significant events and outstanding cultural activists. Kann generally does justice to the Ukrainians of Galicia, Bukovina, and Transcarpathia, even if for the last area he mentions the relatively minor Evhenii Sabov while never even discussing the leading "national awakener" Aleksander Dukhnovych.

More problematic are Kann's generalizations about Ukrainian developments. Describing Galicia's sympathies toward Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, he suggests that the "literary Ukrainian union movement had become irresistible in the half century from the outgoing Enlightenment to the national revolution of 1848" (p. 393). In fact, such an evolution really took place only *after* 1848 and in particular after the 1860s. For the most part, Kann places Ukrainians among the "irredentist"and "centrifugal" factors within the Habsburg Empire. And while it is true that the Ukrainian intelligentsia, especially in Galicia, had by the last decades of the nineteenth century forged close links with their brethren in the Russian Empire, Kann's conclusion that the "Ruthenian people in Galicia and in the Bukovina . . . had violently demanded the breakup of the empire" (p. 507) can hardly be sustained by the historic record. The author is perhaps unduly influenced by the rhetoric of politicians who were able to express themselves in verbally violent form, thanks to Austria's relatively liberal late nineteenth-century constitutional system. But neither that rhetoric nor the patriotic writings of latter-day historians can undo the reality which is reflected in the basic loyalty of western Ukrainians to the Habsburgs, a tradition that began at the very outset of Austrian rule under the enlightened rulers Maria Theresa and Joseph II in the late eighteenth century and which lasted among the masses and among most political leaders until after the outbreak of World War I and even down to the last months of the empire's existence. It is not without good reason that the Ukrainians of Galicia were known in Austrian circles and often liked to refer to themselves as the "Tyrolians of the East."

Paul R. Magocsi
University of Toronto

NATIONBUILDING AND THE POLITICS OF NATIONALISM: ESSAYS ON AUSTRIAN GALICIA. Edited by *Andrei S. Markovits* and *Frank E. Sysyn.* Monograph Series. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982. vii, 343 pp. $9.95, paper. Distributed by Harvard University Press.

Only recently have Western scholars of the multinational Habsburg empire begun to devote attention to the history of Galicia commensurate with the province's strategic importance for the monarchy and its significance for the national and political development of its two major nations. At various times in the nineteenth century Galician Poles and Ukrainians respectively envisaged the province as the dynamic core—a sort of Piedmont—in the national awakening and eventual reunion of all their compatriots and historical possessions in a resurrected greater national state. To be sure, these goals were illusory and mutually contradictory. But the question that still fascinates students of the nation-forming processes in Eastern Europe is how the fluid character of national fortunes under Habsburg rule fostered such aspirations, despite Austria's precarious international position as a great power and Galicia's economic backwardness.

The essays presented in *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism,* befitting a work sponsored by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, place the major accent on the Galician Ukrainians, or Ruthenians (*Rusyny, Rusini, Ruthenen*), as they referred to themselves and were officially designated throughout the nineteenth century. Only one contribution deals exclusively with the province's socially, economically, and, after 1873, politically dominant Poles, while two essays address national politics among Galicia's sizable Jewish minority (eleven percent in 1900). The fact that most of the essays have been previously published (only four appear for the first time in this volume) does not diminish the book's usefulness for students of the multinational empire. Taken together, they provide in a single work a handy selection of the best recent writing in the West on this insufficiently studied region of the monarchy.

The first three essays introduce Austrian policy toward Galicia and provide brief descriptions and analyses of developments among the Poles and Ukrainians from 1848 to 1918. Co-editor Andrei Markovits surveys the Austrian nationalities problem and its specific application in the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, as the Habsburgs designated the lands seized from Poland in the first partition of 1772. The essays by Piotr Wandycz on the Poles and Ivan L. Rudnytsky on the Ukrainians were originally presented at the conference held at Indiana University in 1966 on "The Nationality Problem in the Nineteenth-Century Habsburg Monarchy: A Critical Reappraisal," which symbolized the coming of age of Austrian studies in North America. Professor Rudnytsky has updated his references and revised his essay for republication.

Four of the contributions illuminate aspects of the careers and ideas of prominent Galicians. Ezra Mendelsohn (Hebrew University of Jerusalem) explores the early political activities of Wilhelm Feldman and the tortuous course of Jewish assimilation in Galicia. Until the 1870s those members of the Jewish economic and cultural elite in Lviv who assimilated did so almost exclusively as Germans. Only after the polonization of the provincial capital, when the Poles acquired widespread autonomy from Vienna, did members of the Jewish elite embrace the Polish orientation. Reacting vehemently against what he deemed the stifling life of the East Galician Jewish *shtetl* of his childhood, Feldman became a fervent advocate of the Jews' assimilation as Poles. He attributed the failure of his appeal to draw significant numbers of emancipated urban Jews, most of whom turned to Zionism and socialism, to increasing Polish anti-semitism in the late nineteenth century. Rejected as an apostate by most of his co-religionists (even though he converted to Catholicism only on his death-bed), Feldman, despite distinguished studies on Polish literature, never gained the complete respect of some Polish intellectuals who insisted that no Jew could fully grasp, for example, the intrinsic Polishness of the nation's Romantic literature.

Peter Brock also discusses a case of the personal tragedy of an individual who believed that his people's well-being would best be served in close association with the Polish community. Ivan Vahylevych was a member of the celebrated "Ruthenian Triad" of the 1830s and the author of pioneering studies on the "South Ruthenian" (Ukrainian) language. During the revolutionary turmoil of 1848, when a Galician Ukrainian political program of sorts was advanced by the Greek Catholic hierarchy, Vahylevych allied himself with the rival camp of polonized Ruthenian nobles (*gente Rutheni, natione Poloni*) who tried to foster Ruthenian support for the Polish cause against the machinations of the Austrian imperial government and its Ukrainian ecclesiastical backers. After the suppression of the revolution, when the Greek Catholic consistory insisted Vahylevych do penance for his disobedience, he renounced the priesthood and in bitterness converted to Lutheranism. His apostasy, however, alienated even his erstwhile Polish patrons, and he spent the remainder of his life eking out a meager existence at various hack intellectual jobs. But Brock insists that, unlike Feldman, who saw no place for a distinct Jewish nation in the future, "a feeling of separate Ukrainian identity remained with Vahylevych to the end," even though he believed that all Ukrainians, including those in tsarist Russia, "would opt for membership in a reborn Poland." In the bitter arena of shifting national fortunes in Galicia, both Feldman and Vahylevych chose the losing side.

The most frequently studied figure of Galician Ukrainian political and intellectual life is Ivan Franko. Soviet Ukrainian scholarship in particular has created an industry of making Franko into a "West Ukrainian" progressive national institution. Leonid Rudnytzky examines one feature of Franko's work, however, that has less interested Soviet Ukrainians—

namely, Franko's attitude toward the monarchy and the image of Austria in his fiction and political writings. While the young Franko of his "storm and stress" socialist years felt only bitterness at Austria's apparent failure to protect the Ruthenian peasants (except briefly, and then for ulterior motives, during 1848–49) from abuse and exploitation by their Polish lords and denounced the slavish loyalty of the Old Ruthenians to the monarchy, the mature Franko of the turn of the century took a more favorable view of the Austrian connection. Rudnytzky notes that Franko, "like many members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of that time, [was] a product of Austrian education and of Austrian culture. As such, he, to some degree at least, identified with Austria." Austrian ways, after all, became ingrained in even the most ardent leaders of Austria's subject nationalities. Vienna exerted a sort of magnetic attraction on them even while they adamantly denounced imperial policies, and there is no reason to assume that Franko was less susceptible than others. Rudnytzky's article modifies somewhat the hagiography that has characterized much of the Marxist and nationalist writings on Franko.

The myriad of conflicting influences on the Galician Ukrainian elite also emerges in Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak's essay on Natalia Kobryns'ka, an early proponent of feminism. The daughter and wife of "enlightened" Greek Catholic priests, from an early age she found herself in an uncommon environment where fresh ideas were aired and opinions openly exchanged. (Her experience certainly offers a partial corrective to the usually one-sided picture of the reactionary Greek Catholic priest who kept his rural flock in darkness.) Kobryns'ka read voraciously not only the works of Karl Marx and J. S. Mill, but also those of the Dnieper Ukrainian political theorist Mykhailo Drahomanov. In the 1870s, after her husband's early death, she frequented the circles of the Young Ukrainian radicals in Vienna. As a theorist of feminism and in her practical efforts to organize Ukrainian women in Stanyslaviv, Kobryns'ka had to counter not only the resistance to woman's rights of the clerical hierarchy, but also the notions of her fellow socialists, who maintained that the oppression of women was merely an artifact of bourgeois society that would disappear with the victory of socialism. Kobryns'ka saw feminism as a universal struggle related to but not solely dependent on socioeconomic change.

John-Paul Himka, in an essay on the early efforts to form voluntary associations of Ukrainian artisans in Lviv in the 1870s, likewise touches on the difficulties that national leaders faced in seeking to organize Ukrainian society to defend its interests and rights in an essentially rural, economically underdeveloped land still dominated by Polish nobles and conservative clerical interests. By applying the paradigm advanced by the Czech scholar Miroslav Hroch concerning the importance of participation by merchants and artisans in the formative phase of nationbuilding, Himka demonstrates that the relative absence of these urban constituencies among the Galician Ukrainians meant that the national movement would have to take root in the countryside, where the dominant influence of the

clergy precipitated a social cleavage in the Ukrainian community.

The problem of instilling a national political consciousness among a people living in isolation and dominated by traditionalist religious leaders, is also a theme of Leila P. Everett's study of the dilemma of Jewish politics in Galicia. She examines in particular the Jews' participation in the electoral campaign of 1907, in which both assimilationists and Zionists largely overcame their traditional apathy toward Austrian and Galician political issues. She also explores the difficulties inherent in the attempts of Jewish and Ukrainian politicians, notably Iuliian Romanchuk, to forge a coalition of minorities to block Polish political hegemony.

The volume includes two contributions by Paul R. Magocsi. The first provides a descriptive survey of the main issues and literature on the "language question" that divided Galician Ukrainians for much of the nineteenth century. Magocsi distinguishes three phases: (1) the so-called Alphabet War over the use of the Latin alphabet or the Cyrillic (in either its Old-Slavonic [*kyrylytsiia*] form or its modernized [*hrazhdanka*] script) in written Ukrainian; (2) the partially concurrent conflict over whether the vernacular or the hybrid Slavo-Ruthenian book form with Russian borrowings would be the basis of the written language; and finally (3) the victory of the "Ukrainophiles" and the eventual ascendancy of the Dnieper Ukrainian language of Shevchenko, Kvitka, and Kulish over Great Russian and the Galician Slavo-Ruthenian "jargon" (*iazychiie*), a triumph, to some degree, at the expense of the Galician Ukrainian literary vernacular as it had developed from Shashkevych to Franko.

Magocsi's other contribution is a detailed bibliographical essay on Galician Ukrainian history from 1848 to 1918, comprising portions of his larger bibliographical guide to Galicia which has recently been published by the University of Toronto Press. Because Magocsi aims at providing a comprehensive bibliographical tool for Western scholars, he might have listed some of the many unpublished dissertations devoted to Galician Ukrainian history. I have in mind especially those completed at Austrian and Czech universities between the wars and since 1945 in Poland and West Germany. As may be inevitable in a bibliography that cites titles in over half a dozen languages, a number of minor typographical errors, especially in the Polish entries, have remained in this published version.

For the reader limited to English this volume of essays can serve as a stand-in until a serviceable history of the Galician Ukraine under Austrian rule is written. The thorough index (nineteen pages, double-columned), by no means a standard feature in anthologies, especially enhances the volume's usefulness. A table providing the Ukrainian, Polish, German, and Yiddish forms for major place-names in Galicia is also a helpful addition, as is the map of nineteenth-century Galicia prepared by Paul R. Magocsi. While the line he has drawn demarcating the approximate Polish-Ukrainian "ethnolinguistic" boundary takes full cognizance of Ukrainian settlement in Western Galicia, it offers no indication of the sizable Polish and Jewish settlements in the eastern part of the province.

The volume's editors, Messrs. Markovits and Sysyn, have adopted the probably sensible approach of taking the post-World War II frontier between Poland and the Soviet Ukraine as the basis for using Polish or Ukrainian forms for place-names. However, just as most writers in English today are loath to identify Kaliningrad as the birthplace of Kant and Wrocław as that of Lassalle or to refer to the interwar Free City of Gdańsk, it is likely that most historians, this reviewer included, will continue to cite Galicia's capital as Lemberg or Lwów when addressing pre-1945 Polish and Austrian themes.

Lawrence D. Orton
Oakland University

SHCHODENNYK. TOM PERSHYI: 1911–1922. By *Volodymyr Vynnychenko.* Edited with an introduction by *Hryhory Kostiuk.* Edmonton and New York: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the Vynnychenko Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1980. 499 pp. $30.00.

The Ukrainian national struggle produced no figure more controversial than the mercurial writer and politician who wrote the First Universal, headed independent Ukrainian governments under both the Central Rada and Directory, and briefly visited Moscow in a vain attempt to convince the Soviet government of the need to establish a truly independent Soviet Ukrainian state. His place in the history of Ukrainian literature is as pivotal—and far less ambiguous—than his role in politics: he was the first truly modern Ukrainian writer, and his works remained the most read in the Soviet Ukrainian Republic until the state banned them in the late 1920s.

Perhaps no other figure exemplifies the creative tension between nationalism and socialism, a tension which characterized the revolutionaries who led the Dnieper Ukrainians to independence after the fall of the Russian Empire. Before the revolution, he was a typical professional revolutionary, hiding from the *okhrana* and dreaming of the Marxist utopia which would not only free his homeland but also usher in social justice and equality. Even as a national leader, he still thought in terms of a mythical dichotomy between revolution and counterrevolution. This was the source of his tragedy: the faint hope that the Ukrainian nation could somehow be aligned with a "revolution" whose leaders had no understanding or respect for Ukrainian national aspirations.

Such a figure hardly fit the heroic approach to history characteristic of much of the Ukrainian immigration. The Soviets, for their part, have long since banned him to the netherworld of "bourgeois nationalism." It is as if the two had joined in an unspoken conspiracy of silence. Over the years, Hryhory Kostiuk, as head of the Vynnychenko Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., has labored to return to Ukrainians this central figure from their past. He and the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies have done a great service to all serious students of Ukrainian history and literature by beginning the publication of Vynnychenko's diaries, which contain information about the genesis and development of Vynnychenko's novels, as well as the political struggle of a revolutionary who was caught between the so-called "bourgeois" nationalism of Petliura and the "socialist" imperialism of Moscow. For years, Kostiuk has published articles, telling us how misunderstood a figure Vynnychenko was. Now he has given us an essential tool for understanding him.

James E. Mace
Harvard University

NESTOR MAKHNO IN THE RUSSIAN CIVIL WAR. By *Michael Malet.* London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1982. 232 pp. $42.00.

History is usually written from the perspective of the winners rather than from that of the losers, and among modern historians no other group has embraced the modern cult of success more blindly than those Hegelian-Marxists who have accepted the judgment of history as truth itself. To this positivism of success, Leninist *Realpolitik* added the notion that the seizure of power shows the truth of the theory of those who come to power. The politically defeated are shown to be wrong in theory and are consigned to the dustheap of history.

The dominance of this conception may help explain the fate that befell Makhno and the Makhnivshchyna among scholars, among the politically and historically informed public, and even among the Left, in spite of the important role that their movement played in the Russian Civil War and, ultimately, in the triumph of the Bolsheviks in the Ukraine. Soviet sources, following Trotsky's attack on the Makhnivshchyna as "anarchist-kulak debauchery," have consistently scorned or dismissed the phenomenon as a blind, primitive, archaic or outright reactionary movement. Western historians and social scientists have generally ignored or neglected to study the phenomenon. Émigré Ukrainians, distrustful of anything that appears to have undermined the formation of a Ukrainian

nation-state, have failed to claim the Makhnivshchyna as a legitimate component of the Ukrainian historical tradition. Even anarchist sources, with the exception of the participants in the movement and of Spanish anarchists, who received it warmly, have shown a highly ambivalent attitude towards the Makhnivshchyna, uncertain about the anarchist nature and perhaps bewildered by the peasant character of the movement. Thus, any new historical study of the movement is to be welcomed, all the more so when it has the qualities of Michael Malet's *Nestor Makhno in the Russian Civil War.*

It is significant that the first English-language monograph on Makhno, Michael Palij's *The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno* (1976), was written from a Ukrainian perspective. It examined the most neglected character of the movement, namely, its Ukrainian character. Palij argued that the Makhnivshchyna could be understood properly only within the context of the Ukrainian revolution. In this sense, his book was addressed as much to Western readers ignorant of Ukrainian affairs, as to Ukrainian nationalists who had failed to take into account this significant phenomenon of twentieth-century Ukrainian history. To a certain extent, Malet's book, as the author himself indicates, can be seen as complementary to Palij's book. The analysis centers precisely on those aspects of the movement which were less systematically treated by Palij: the complex relationship with the Bolsheviks, the military, socioeconomic and political organization of the Makhnivshchyna, the anarchist ideology of the movement, and the similarities and differences with other insurgent movements of the time, like those led by Hryhoriiv, S. S. Antonov, and "the Greens."

Malet's perspective is clearly sympathetic to anarchism and to the ideals of the Makhnivshchyna, and thus he takes seriously, though critically, the self-interpretation of the participants in the movement (Makhno, Volin, Arshinov). Yet, Malet also uses systematically the most relevant Soviet sources, while being aware at the same time of the Ukrainian context in which the movement developed. This combination of perspectives, rarely found in the existing studies of the Makhnivshchyna, and the way in which Malet incorporates them critically into his analysis probably account for the strength and qualities of Malet's book. While those already familiar with the existing literature on Makhno and his movement may not find any significant revelations, the book offers nonetheless the most balanced, systematic and readable account of the Makhnivshchyna. Neither does Malet pretend to offer a novel interpretation of the movement, but he underscores more forcefully than have others the primarily peasant and quasi-spontaneous character of the movement. It is true that its inner core—Makhno and the close group of friends who served as the military leaders of the Insurgent Army and who were above all loyal to "Bat'ko" Makhno—had been influenced somewhat by anarchist ideas. These ideas received a more systematic elaboration with the arrival of the Nabat anarchist intellectuals in 1919, who took charge of the cultural-educational section of the movement. But Malet shows convincingly that it was the land

question that gave rise to the movement and offers the key to its historical fate.

Malet ties the flow and ebb of the movement to the land policies of the successive governments which were trying precariously to maintain control over southeastern Ukraine. The reactionary and repressive anti-peasant policies of the government of Hetman Skoropads'kyi, tied to the occupation by foreign forces, gave the first massive impulse to the movement; the inconsistent land policies of the Directory explain the failure of the Ukrainian nationalist government to gain the loyalty of the Ukrainian peasants of the left bank; meanwhile the anti-peasant land policies of the Bolsheviks and the food requisitioning of war communism only exacerbated the anti-Russian and anti-town feelings which were widespread among Ukrainian peasants. More than any ideological attraction towards anarchism, it was this negative context, together with the positive land policies of Makhno, which would explain the widespread peasant support of the movement. Although it was the military defeat of the Insurgent Army by the Red Army which ultimately put an end to the Makhnivshchyna, Malet argues that the military defeat itself was conditioned by the new Soviet land policy introduced by NEP and by the new Red tactics of quartering troops in the rebel villages. Both measures together served to cut off the support of an exhausted peasantry. Unfortunately, Malet does not explore systematically the question of the possible elective affinities between anarchism as an ideology and the peasants' ideal and material interests, though it serves as the unexamined background to his interpretation of the Makhnivshchyna.

After reading Malet's solidly researched study one can come to the conclusion that, barring any major disclosure of new sources from inaccessible Soviet archives, no major revelations concerning Makhno, his anarchism, and the military side of the Makhnivshchyna should be expected. Detailed local history would be the natural direction for fruitful new research on the movement, but given the constraints of doing field work in the Soviet Union, perhaps only new conceptual outlooks will offer new insights. Two lines of inquiry seem to me most promising. One would be to concentrate on the peasant and social movement character of the Makhnivshchyna, drawing on analytical categories taken from the social science literature on social movements, as well as on social history paradigms which have explored peasant reactions to and the role of peasant movements in the formation of the modern world. Another promising line of inquiry would be to undertake comparative studies of the Makhnivshchyna and of Spanish peasant anarchism, both in Andalusia, where anarchism underwent a long formative process of development and where it took authentic ideological roots, and in Aragon, sometimes named "the Spanish Ukraine," where rural anarchism and an autonomous anarchist government also emerged suddenly in the context of revolution and civil war under the ideological influence, and at times, in the Spanish case, under the political coercion of urban industrial anarchism. The fact that the only two

historical experiments at anarchist self-government, the Makhnivshchyna and the "Consejo de Aragon," were put down by the Communists makes the comparison the more interesting. But in spite of the evident similarities between the two anarchist movements, the aim of such comparative studies should not be to reduce these movements to a common denominator, but to accentuate through a differential comparison the characteristics particular to each of them and thus come to a better understanding of both.

José V. Casanova
Passaic County College

ANGELS IN STALIN'S PARADISE: WESTERN REPORTERS IN SOVIET RUSSIA, 1917–1937. A CASE STUDY OF LOUIS FISCHER AND WALTER DURANTY. By *James William Crowl.* Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982. viii, 224 pp. $21.75 cloth, $10.75 paper.

Were two of the leading American journalists posted to Moscow in the 1920s and 1930s communist sympathizers or even paid agents of the Soviet government? According to Dr. Crowl's monograph, it is quite possible. Originally written as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Virginia, this new book critically examines the careers and reporting of the two American journalists who did more than anyone else actively to help Stalin conceal the most brutal aspects of his regime.

If any individuals are to blame for the fact that the Ukrainian famine of 1933 never really became part of public consciousness in the West, we must point to Duranty and Fischer. Dr. Crowl explores how they accomplished this masterpiece of concealment and why, and his judgment is harsh:

> A few correspondents, among them Duranty and Fischer, went beyond mere compliance with the censorship. While most of their colleagues passively accepted the famine cover-up, they echoed Soviet denials of the famine and blasted anyone who carried word of conditions to the West. Their distortion of the news, then, went beyond the demands of the censorship and was a vital factor in convincing the West that there was little or no truth to the famine stories. Moreover, by their active role in the cover-up they made it more unlikely that the foreign press in Moscow might force some kind of showdown with the censors or confront the West with the truth about Soviet conditions. (p. 147)

Why did they do it? Fischer came from an impoverished background and yearned for the success and status of an expert who could explain the USSR to Americans, but he also saw genuine hope in the "Soviet

experiment," which for a time seemed to offer the promise of a better life for the common man and a way to mitigate ethnic hatreds, and which for some years followed a consistently anti-fascist foreign policy. The author's judgment of Duranty is more complex and far less redemptive. Duranty was also a man with a chip on his shoulder who loved the limelight, but he possessed no strong convictions beyond a belief in himself. When the opportunity for a post in Moscow arose, Duranty cast off his previous expressions of anti-communism and did everything possible to ingratiate himself with the regime. His prognostications were far from the mark, but he wrote them in such a way that he could claim a virtual clairvoyance however things turned out. One of the best informed of the foreign press colony (and its social leader), in private conversation Duranty often showed that he had an excellent idea of what was really going on. But he did not write it, which led a number of his colleagues to conclude that he was either paid by the regime or that the latter had something it could hold over him. Whichever it was, Duranty became the Soviet Union's foremost propagandist for the American audience, and the one who enjoyed the prestigious forum of the *New York Times.*

Crowl knows no Russian, and his familiarity with the secondary literature on the Soviet Union of the period is rudimentary. It would be tempting to fault him on this score. Actually, he has turned this lack to advantage, in that he was obliged to rely on the observers who confronted the famine first-hand rather than get bogged down in the Sovietological literature, which is still under the influence of the "cover-up" he exposes. While he has little feel for the ethnic complexity of the part of the world he is dealing with (the 1921 famine is called the "Volga famine," and he seems unaware that the Ukrainians ever played any active role in Soviet politics or that the mass starvation of the Kazakhs actually took place in 1930), his contribution is a significant one. His work will be of great interest to all students of the period, and especially to all who wonder how it was possible for Stalin to create the famine of 1933, kill millions by starvation, and then conceal what he had done from the Western world.

James E. Mace
Harvard University

THE HOLOCAUST AND THE HISTORIANS. By *Lucy S. Dawidowicz.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981. 187 pp. $15.00.

Lucy Dawidowicz has felt a compelling urgency about the history of the Holocaust: if the story is not told, and told accurately, she argues, it

might vanish like the victims themselves. Until recently there appeared strong ground for such apprehension. General histories in Europe and North America ignored the subject, while those in Communist countries falsified it, twisting accounts of the fate of the Jews to suit ideological ends. Discussions of this unprecedented attempt to eliminate an entire people frequently either ignored the particularity of the Jewish experience or distorted its significance. To redress this wrong, Dawidowicz now calls upon historians to remove biases, "offset subjectivity," and apply "methodological rigor." Unfortunately, her own work seems sufficiently inattentive to these injunctions to weaken the presentation of her case. The cause is just, but the argument used to sustain it is sometimes flawed.

Dawidowicz stands on strongest ground in her scathing assessment of Soviet and Polish accounts of the Jewish catastrophe, illustrating how the murder of Jews, simply because they were Jews, accorded ill with postwar Communist interpretations of the recent past. In the Soviet Union there has been a continuing accent on the supposed lack of divisions among Soviet nationalities during "the Great Patriotic War": historical interpretation, we are told, must therefore rivet upon the anti-Soviet character of the Nazi assault, and not be distracted by such irrelevancies as genocide against the Jewish people. In Poland nationalistic sentiment and the strength of wartime anti-Jewish feeling influence a reduction of the official importance accorded Hitler's massacre of three million Polish Jews, and have even led to the suppression of embarrassing evidence. Aided by a deep current of antisemitism persisting in both countries, those concerned with directing how history is written have downplayed a specifically Jewish victimization in the interests of their war against Zionism. The result has been a mockery of historical exposition, tragically engulfing even those few Yiddish-language publications still originating in Eastern Europe. Those unacquainted with how battalions of historians in the USSR and Poland have been wheeled about on the scholarly parade ground and drilled by a party elite should ponder Dawidowicz's two chapters on this theme.

Other sections of this book, however, appear unbalanced or lacking in authority. Dawidowicz is thin on German scholarship, concentrating heavily on historians of the last generation (Friedrich Meinecke, Gerhard Ritter, Hans Rothfels), clearly too close chronologically to the Nazi era. She singles out Karl Dietrich Bracher alone for praise because of his unsparing portrayal of the German roots of Nazism and his emphasis on the role of ideology, with its central importance of antisemitism. But she has nothing to say about Ernst Nolte or Eberhard Jäckel, whose work on Nazi ideas is surely important in this same respect. Given her criticism of German historians for paying insufficient attention to the Holocaust, it is odd that she does not consider more seriously the numerous relevant articles published in the *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte* since 1953. Her quarrel with this important periodical and the institute which publishes it is the "preferred stance of noninvolvement," "overload of factual detail," and "attitude of moral disengagement" that she attributes to their

researchers. Such sweeping comments are curious coming from a scholar who champions "the rigors of the critical-historical method." Dawidowicz also ignores recent German scholarly work which has actually focused on the persecution and murder of the Jews. There is a single footnote sentence dismissing Martin Broszat's article on the Final Solution ("a very convoluted but unconvincing explanation"), although it has occasioned widespread discussion, and no mention at all of Uwe Dietrich Adam, Helmut Genschel, or Helmut Krausnick, all of whom have made significant contributions.

Elsewhere, Dawidowicz's own interpretations of Holocaust history seem to have limited her range of vision. She downgrades Raul Hilberg's pioneering work, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, first published in 1961 and probably the single most important book ever written on the subject, apparently because of a sharp disagreement with Hilberg on Jewish resistance. Resistance, however, was dealt with on only a very few of Hilberg's nearly eight hundred pages, which are devoted to an exhaustive analysis of the Nazi machinery of destruction. Unhappy with the understandable tendency of Israeli historians to emphasize Jewish resistance or to concentrate upon the discovery of evidence, she ignores or depreciates much historical work on the Holocaust done in Israel. Yehuda Bauer, the author of several important volumes, is summarily dismissed for a popular pamphlet published in 1973.

My own sense is that the polemical undercurrent of this work has got the better of the critical historian who wrote it. Dawidowicz seems passionately offended not only by distortions or silence about the Holocaust, but also by other explanations which she thinks might distract attention from the limitless evil of Nazi policy toward the Jews. Interpretations which seek patiently to explain, which concentrate on administrative processes or which probe other aspects of this monstrous drama she considers tangential or even worse. Thus she neglects a whole range of studies which examine the role of Allied governments, populations of occupied countries, churches, or Jews outside Europe. She does not discuss local studies or recent research on German public opinion which challenge her contention that Germans embraced Hitler's ideas about Jews. And she derides efforts of psychohistorians to write about Hitler.

One wishes Dawidowicz had shown more interest in legitimate historical debate. For example, in her condemnation of one Communist memoir of the ghetto in Vilnius she ridicules the idea that Itzik Wittenberg, leader of the city's Jewish underground, voluntarily turned himself over to the Germans and then committed suicide in order to spare the ghetto a Nazi-perpetrated massacre. "Of course the Gestapo murdered him," is her reply, and she refers the reader to her own book "for an account of these events as they really happened." But an extensive survey of the incident in the fullest study of the Vilnius ghetto we have to date, by Yitzhak Arad, sustains precisely the Communist account.[1] Here, as elsewhere in

her book, Dawidowicz's commendable determination to rescue this history from "the black pit of oblivion" has weakened her curiosity and narrowed her field of vision.

Michael R. Marrus
University of Toronto

RECOLLECTIONS ABOUT THE LIFE OF THE FIRST UKRAINIAN SETTLERS IN CANADA. By *William A. Czumer (Vasyl' Chumer)*. Translated by *Louis Laychuk*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1981. 163 pp. $9.95 cloth, $5.95 paper.

ETHNIC CHICAGO. Edited by *Peter d'A. Jones* and *Melvin G. Holli.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdman, 1981. 384 pp. $14.95.

IDENTIFICATIONS: ETHNICITY AND THE WRITER IN CANADA. Edited by *Jars Balan.* Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1982. 158 pp. $7.95, paper.

These three recent publications are collections of essays and personal insights united by a single thread. They represent significant advances on various fronts in the field of ethnic studies in North America. Each has its own shortcomings, but these do not detract from the ultimate value of the individual works. This is especially evident when one considers that each book is a pioneering contribution.

William Czumer's *Recollections About the Life of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada* is a translation of his earlier *Spomyny pro perezhyvannia pershykh ukrains'kykh pereselentsiv v Kanadi.* It is an amateurish and eclectic, yet fascinating collection of press clippings, reminiscences, and personal observations compiled by the author to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Ukrainian settlement in Canada. When Czumer's *Spomyny* were published in 1942, they represented the first real effort by Ukrainian Canadians to present an impartial historical account of themselves. Because of Czumer's lack of personal and professional resources, it was to be expected that the project would fall short of its original intentions (the full scope of the work as originally perceived is noted on pp. 147–149 of

[1] Yitzhak Arad, *Ghetto in Flames: The Struggle and Destruction of the Jews in Vilna in the Holocaust* (Jerusalem, 1980).

the translated version). Nevertheless, the author managed to produce one of the most insightful sketches of Ukrainian-Canadian life published to that time, and Czumer's *Spomyny* has remained a classic to this day.

Given the significance of this work, its republication in translation by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies is welcome. The vignettes presented in the *Recollections* still have value as historical sources; moreover, its unabashed nature provides an invaluable glimpse at the texture of life in those times. On the whole, the quality of the translation is quite good, and Manoly Lupul's introduction helps considerably in setting the stage. The only criticism of the CIUS publication which might be offered is the fact that the shortcomings and inaccuracies of Czumer's original work have not been duly noted. There are a number of valuable footnotes throughout the text, but these are not sufficient to put the entire work into perspective.

Ethnic Chicago is a collection of original essays which attempts to assess the impact of ethnic groups on the windy city, and vice-versa. This is a novel approach to synthesizing the rapidly developing fields of urban and ethnic history. As with any collection of this type, the essays are of mixed quality. In *Ethnic Chicago* this is especially evident because the topic requires the developing of a basic narrative structure, the illustrating of interaction between ethnic groups and the city, and the comparing of ethnic group experiences in a specific location with those of their counterparts throughout the United States. Some essays, such as those on the Irish, the Jews, and the Japanese-Americans, succeed admirably at their respective tasks.

Unfortunately, the one essay of particular interest to Ukrainian studies does not really deal with any of the above themes. Myron Kuropas's "Ukrainian Chicago: The Making of a Nationality Group in America" (pp. 140–179) is a good survey of Ukrainian-American life to 1939; however, it is not an appropriate study of Chicago's Ukrainian community per se. Rather, it uses the former as a vehicle (not a case study) for the latter. The end result is a missed opportunity to break new ground in the field of Ukrainian-American studies. This is all the more unfortunate since Kuropas's impressive grasp of primary sources suggests that he must have had at hand the raw material for a substantially different essay, and because the author has already had the opportunity to present his thesis in other places (e.g., his Ph.D. dissertation and his book *The Ukrainian Experience in the United States*).

Finally, *Identifications: Ethnicity and the Writer in Canada*, the collected papers of a 1979 conference sponsored by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and the University of Alberta's Department of English and Comparative Literature, is a breakthrough that establishes a non-English and non-French category in Canadian belles-lettres. The conference participants (most of them writers, not seasoned academics) sought for a definition of ethnicity in Canadian literature, discovered and affirmed its integrity (discussion, p. 75 ff.), and made a claim for its legitimacy (the

concluding comments, p. 154). The papers and particularly the round-table discussions were marked by a considerable amount of soul-searching. In the end, it was a very powerful and moving event, and its emotions have not been lost in the transfer of the proceedings into print. The conference succeeded in its aim "to make a modest contribution toward broadening Canadian literature beyond the usual bilingual perimeters" (p. x). In spite of the mixed scholarly quality of its essays, *Identifications* is an important work simply for being the remaining record of a landmark event.

Andrij Makuch
Ukrainian Canadian Committee
Saskatchewan Provincial Council

INDEX TO VOLUME VI (1982)

A. Articles, Bibliographic Studies, Documents, and Review Articles (listed by author/keyword)

B. Reviews (listed by reviewer/author of book/key word)